DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 731 IR 051 912

TITLE Task Force on Organization, Coordination and Staffing. Final Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Santa Barbara. University Library.
PUB DATE 7 Mar 86
NOTE 171p.; For reports from other task forces, see IR 051 910-914.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Administrative Organization; Charts; Communication (Thought Transfer); Higher Education; *Library Administration; *Library Personnel; Organizational Climate; *Personnel Management; Recruitment; Self Evaluation (Groups); Staff Development; Surveys; Training
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Santa Barbara

ABSTRACT

This document describes an investigation of the adequacy of the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) Library's organizational structure, organizational climate, staffing patterns, training, career development, and communication to meet the needs of a postulated public services environment of 5 to 10 years in the future. Discussion of the study methodology, highlights of interviews with members of the library administration and a survey of library staff, are included. The findings and recommendations are presented in four sections, each of which is devoted to a task force goal for one of the following major study components: (1) the structure, management, and staffing patterns of the library's public services; (2) hiring practices, training programs, and career development programs; (3) organizational climate; and (4) formal and informal communication networks. A bibliography and other supporting materials are included as part of each section. It was concluded that significant change must take place within the UCSB Library to effectively meet future client and societal expectations. The survey instrument and survey response data are appended. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297731

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION AND STAFFING

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

FINAL REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Boisse

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Judi Aftergut
Linda Broderick
Carol Gibbens
Gail McCredie
Jo Anna Moore, Co-Chair
8/85-1/86
Patricia Pung
Robert Sivers, Co-Chair
8/85-1/86
Chair 2/86
Kim Thompson

MARCH 7, 1986

R

IR 051 912

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Pages
ABSTRACT	I
INTRODUCTION	2-7
METHODOLOGY	8
FINDINGS	8
RECOMMENDATIONS	
OCS GOAL I	9-28
OCS GOAL II	29-52
OCS GOAL III	53-86
OCS GOAL IV	87-98
APPENDICES	
OCS QUESTIONNAIRE	99-111
RESPONSE DATA FOR THE OCS QUESTIONNAIRE	112
OCS QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICAL RESULTS	
PART I	
LIBRARY-WIDE	113-119
MANAGEMENT	120-126
NON-MANAGEMENT	127-133
REFERENCE SERVICES	134-140
NON-REFERENCE SERVICES	141-147
ACADEMIC	148-154
NON-ACADEMIC	155-161
PART II	162-168

R

OCS TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT

ABSTRACT

The charge to the OCS Task Force was to review the adequacy of the UCSB Library's organizational structure, organizational climate, staffing patterns, training, career development and communication. The degree to which they were to be considered adequate was to be determined by how well they measured up against a postulated public services environment of some five to ten years in the future.

The OCS Task Force has reviewed the literature, postulated a future environment in which the public services must operate, discussed outstanding problems with members of the Library Administration, and conducted an extensive survey on morale, communication and management planning. Our findings are that significant change must take place within the UCSB Library, if we are to effectively meet future client and societal expectations.

Accordingly, our recommendations include the establishment of a public, coordinated, library-wide planning effort; the reorganization of the Library's public services; the use of new methods for determining staffing patterns; conducting a skills assessment and a library-wide job audit; expansion of Library orientation programs; a much expanded career development program; a phased, alternate work schedule experiment; a motivation and rewards program; regular, interactive meetings and open office hours at all levels in the Library; a much more visible, interactive and hands-on style of management; the public definition of an expected communication style by top level management; and, the appointment of a communication coordinator who would provide for confidential upward feedback of 1. communication problems which exist and 2. problems which are not being communicated.

INTRODUCTION

In this introduction we shall follow the Task Force Final Reports: Guidelines and Outline Format as best we can. We will include the charge to the OCS Task Force, the OCS Action Plan (which constitutes our interpretation of that charge), and a short statement of the problems experienced by the Task Force in meeting the objectives. As to the "...description of the current public services scenario/configuration in the areas studied by the OCS Task Force", we refer the Study Team to its own study published under Phase I, and to the results of the OCS Questionnaire in the Appendix to this Final Report.

I. The Charge to the Task Force

"This Task Force is to review the current organizational structure and the current staffing patterns of public service activities, and assess their ability to effectively meet future use needs. In its deliberations the Task Force will want to consider:

The impact of the current organizational structure on public service activities and recommendations concerning future structure;

The overall coordination of public services;

Methods for improving communication and information-sharing through the library;

Recommendations to insure the optimal use of human resources;

Employee training, retraining, and career development in light of the changing roles of public services staff in academic research libraries;

Recommendations for improving the organizational climate of the library;

Recommendations to insure that staffing is appropriate to accomodate patron needs and use patterns;

Recommendations for insuring consistency in service policies and procedures.

This Task Force will focus on the overall delivery of public services as we look to the future and will avoid areas of individual personnel problems."

II. The OCS Task Force Interpretation of the Study Team Charge

The OCS interpretation of the Study Team Charge is contained in the OCS Action Plan. We provide it below with those sections which the deleted in January 1986 shown in brackets.

Introduction

The OCS Task Force accepts the charge as given, namely: "... to review the current organization structure and the current staffing patterns of public service activities, and assess their ability to effectively meet future user needs."

The OCS Task Force proposes to group the subjects of the charge into four components: 1. The organization and management of the UCSB Library's public services; 2. UCSB Library hiring practices, training programs and career development programs; 3. The organizational climate of the UCSB Library; and, 4. Formal and informal communications networks within the UCSB Library. On the following pages, these four component subjects of the charge have been rephrased as future library goals by the OCS Task Force members. They are accompanied by the research objectives that the task force has determined are necessary to obtain them. We are convinced that all four goals interlock, and that they must, therefore, be treated with equal priority. However, to comply with the Study Team's request to list each element in priority order, we provide the following initial rankings. Goals I-IV are ranked respectively 1-4. Objectives 1.-4. of Goal I are ranked respectively 1-4. Objectives 1.-2. of Goal II are ranked respectively 1-2. Objectives 1.-3. of Goal III are ranked respectively: 1, 3, 2. Objectives 1.-2. of Goal IV are ranked respectively 1-2. Following the objectives are the methods we propose as relevant and appropriate to carry out the objectives. We have divided the methods into two categories: 1. Essential and 2. Desirable.

After further consideration of the proposed research methods, we provide the following timeline. Literature searches, the determination of survey questions and the scope of our inventories are scheduled for October. In early November, we will divide into sub-groups, each of which will be responsible for one of the four goals. Concurrently, the OCS Task Force will meet weekly in order to evaluate our progress relative to our goals, objectives and methods. At the conclusion of any one of these reviews, we may decide to eliminate lower priority objectives or methods. We anticipate the conclusion of data collection and preliminary analysis by the Christmas holidays. January will be devoted to writing the OCS report. Our estimated deadline for completion is February 3, 1986.

GOAL I

Organizational Structure and Management

To understand the current organizational structures, functions and staffing of UCSB Library services and to recommend any needed changes that will enhance the Library's response to the changing needs of its users, it staff and those of the University during the next five to ten years.

OBJECTIVES

1. To study the impact of the current organizational structure and staffing patterns on public services activities, and to consider changes, if any, that may improve the capacity of this Library to respond to the future needs of its users.

[2. To determine the level, location, coordination, and scope of current decision making within the UCSB Library; to study the extent to which such decision making corresponds to that prescribed in policy documents or formal organization charts; and, to consider whether actual or prescribed patterns of decision making are consistent with or supportive of the kinds of services likely to be needed by future library users.]

[3. To determine current UCSB Library uses of the talents, skills, knowledge and abilities of its several classes of personnel, and to consider the changes in these patterns, if any, which the effective provision of future services are likely to require.]

4. To determine the extent to which service goals, objectives, and policies are identified, articulated, coordinated, implemented and evaluated; and to examine the need for and the function of these statements and procedures in the future operations of the UCSB Library.

RESEARCH METHODS

I. Essential

A. Literature searches.
B. Review of organizational charts, and policies on organizational functions.
[C. Personal interviews.]
[D. Inventory of employee specialized talents and skills.]

[II. Desirable]

[A. Examination of organization policies produced by comparable libraries]
[B. Site visits at comparable libraries.]

GOAL II

Hiring Practices, Training and Career Development

To characterize probable, future changes in service demands required of the academic research library, and to recommend recruitment practices, continuing education, training, retraining, and career development programs which will improve this library's capacity to respond to the rising expectations of the user and the power of developing library technology.

OBJECTIVES

1. To understand probable future changes in services capabilities within the academic research library, the types of services which such capacities will encourage the library user to expect, and the resultant changes in level and extent of education, abilities and skills which such changes will require.

2. To characterize current UCSB Library recruitment practices, continuing education, training, retraining, and career development programs; to consider their adequacy in the changing service environment of the UCSB Library five to ten years from now; and to recommend such changes or enhancements in these programs so as to attract, develop and hold library career employees capable of satisfying the many new service expectations made possible through advanced technology.

RESEARCH METHODS

I. Essential

A. Literature searches.
[B. Surveys or inventories of needs.]
C. Survey of Employees

II. Desirable

[A. Discussions with personnel in similar organizations.]
[B. Discussions with consultants.]

GOAL III

Organizational Climate

To understand the components of an organizational climate that is both receptive to change as well as supportive of excellence in library service; and, as a consequence of such understanding and in the light of data collected on the morale in the UCSB Library, to make appropriate recommendations on the maintenance or change of the local organizational climate.

OBJECTIVES

1. To evaluate the organizational climate within the UCSB Library, so that recommendations for the maintenance or change of the components that create it can be addressed.

[2. To study successful methods by which organizations have effectively coped with rapid and significant change, and to make recommendations, if any, on their implementation at the UCSB Library.]

3. To determine successful means by which the call for excellence in organizations is effectively articulated, and how its achievement is recognized and rewarded; and to make recommendations, if any, on the implementation of such methods at the UCSB Library

RESEARCH METHODS

I. Essential

A. Survey of employees.
B. Literature searches.
C. Inventory of needed employee assistance services.

[II. Desirable]

[A. Personal interviews with staff.]
[B. Discussions with consultants]
[C. Site visits at comparable institutions.]

GOAL IV

Communication

To understand and evaluate the effectiveness of both formal and informal communication patterns at the UCSB Library; and to make any necessary recommendations to ensure appropriate and timely communication as the UCSB Library undergoes the changes resulting from consortial activities and advanced technology.

OBJECTIVES

1. To characterize major modes, means and content of communication to and within the UCSB Library, and to evaluate their effectiveness in transmitting needed information in time for effective action.

2. To study other methods and models used for the successful communication of timely information, and to consider their application in the future environment of the UCSB Library.

RESEARCH METHODS

I. Essential

A. Survey of information needs.
[B. Personal interviews.]
C. Literature searches.
D. Survey of Employees

[II. Desirable]

[A. Discussions with personnel in similar organizations.]
[B. Charting current communication channels.]

III. Problems In Meeting the Goals of the OCS Plan

The major problem was unrealistic planning. It is best exemplified in our underestimation of the amount of time needed to prepare a questionnaire of the scope planned by the Task Force. A second problem was that the time required to carry out our work responsibilities left inadequate time to work on Task Force responsibilities. A third series of problems, though less significant than the first two, were the unexpected crash of the computer used to sort data from the questionnaire, some failures in communication, and the illness of the graduate student running the program.

METHODOLOGY

The OCS Task Force used computer searching of the ERIC, LISA, MANAGEMENT CONTENTS, NTIS, SOCIAL SCISEARCH and MELVYL databases to review the literature published on the issues it wished to address. One Task Force subcommittee performed manual searches using Library Literature. All searches provided citations to publications of outstanding quality. A major frustration was that many of the monographs and journal articles on library management or management in general were not part of the UCSB Library's collection.

A second method used by the OCS Task Force was the lengthy questionnaire designed by our members. This provided a great deal of data for the Task Force. Unfortunately, the amount of time required to produce the questionnaire, administer it, and to generate the data significantly limited the time available to interpret it. Nevertheless, the Task Force was able to test a number of major hyposthesis it adopted prior to constructing the questionnaire.

The third method used was the interview. Two subcommittees discussed several of their major topics with the University Librarian, the Associate University Librarian and the Associate University Librarian, Personnel. These proved to be educational and allowed an opportunity for a frank exchange of views.

FINDINGS

The findings, using the methods described in the paragraphs above, are included in the bibliographies which conclude the recommendations for each OCS Task Force goal. The results of the OCS questionnaire are contained in the Appendices to this report. The interviews were reported verbally at meetings of the OCS Task Force, and are unavailable to the Study Team in written form. The issues raised in the findings are referred to in the discussions of the respective recommendations.

OCS GOAL I

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE IN THE

STRUCTURE, MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING PATTERNS OF PUBLIC SERVICES

WITHIN THE LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

Introduction

In the final analysis, recommendations are judgement calls based on a mixture of research, opinion, inference, experience, values and imagination. It would, therefore, be wrong to pretend that our proposals are the unavoidable conclusions of evidence, logic and authority. They are not. Indeed, if our review of the literature has taught us anything, it is that "authorities" i.e., those in the library world who publish research and opinion, have really not found the answer to any of the lines of inquiry which constitute the OCS Action Plan: Goal I. Thus, from the standpoint of authority, our conclusions are threefold:

1. There is no published organizational structure that stands out over all others as objectively the best.(Bryan, p. 62; Mockler, p. 147; Person, Ruth p.181)

2. There is no off-the-shelf staffing formula which will yield astaffing pattern that is just and rational. (Vasi, p. 5)

3. There is no published set of policies or procedures of which the authors can promise that, when implemented, optimal use will have made of a library's human resources.(Redfern, p. 193)

It is not merely "authority" which supports such statements. They are also supported by the observation that unexpected changes in technology, academic emphases or behavior theory have often transformed yesterday's avant garde management re-structurings into today's embarrassments. However, there is a still more fundamental support for the three generalizations listed above. It is the basic lcgical imperative that the excellence of a library's management can be measured only by the degree to which it successfully employs structure, staffing and talent to achieve what it has determined to be the Library's purposes and priorities. This will be adopted as an operating principal in the recommendations to follow.

In turn, the Library's purposes and priorities are subject to institutional, technological and societal constraints. Thus the subject of this set of recommendations for the OCS report cannot simply be about means (i. e., organizational structure, staffing patterns, and human resources) as they are employed to achieve this Library's mission(s), goals and objectives. It is also about those environmental factors which must be postulated for the next five to ten years as limits to the range of planned achievements from which this Library can choose.

The foundation for our recommendations is thus a reading of the future. In undertaking a reading of the future, we are uncomfortably aware that most of those who predict it are proved wrong by the events that follow. Nevertheless, prediction and adjustment to the unexpected results produced by subsequent events are the givens of library planning. Since such planning determines structure, staffing, and the use of human resources, the fulfilment of our charge must involve some reasonable speculations about conditions at the end of this decade and well into the next. Listed below are some of those that are likely to affect decisively all future planning and programs at this Library.

1. Within ten years the provision of electronic information by libraries will equal the provision of information through the printed form.

2. Within ten years, this campus will succeed in its drive for overall excellence of scholarship as measured against national standards.

3. Within ten years, the demands on UCSB students for highly informed, quality performance will have increased significantly. The source of these demands will be international, national, state-wide and local.

4. Within ten years, the number of graduate students at UCSB will be 150% of what it is today.

5. Within ten years, the enrollment at this campus will approach 20,000 students.

6. Within ten years, the innovations required for the production of the fifth generation computer will have been adapted for use in the personal computer thereby significantly increasing its information processing power.

7. Within ten years, the end-user will be capable of obtaining a broad variety of electronically delivered information without an intermediary.

8. Within ten years, there will be a large increase in the demand for advanced information service, the satisfaction of which will require specialized subject knowledge and advanced knowledge of software capabilities.

9. Within ten years, the fundamental decisions will have been made on whether libraries or some alternate form of organization will be the primary providers of the advanced information services noted in 8 above.

****

RECOMMENDATION I. That the management team of this Library provide management structures, staffing patterns, and programs of personnel development that are demonstratively determined by a set of operational plans and priorities. (By "operational", we mean that the goals, objectives and priorities adopted will each contain a sequence of target accomplishments such that progress toward their achievement can objectively be determined.)

Discussion: What we are recommending is the production and distribution of co-ordinated, public papers on library planning. They can, and probably should, be written in essay form. Since they will include both short-term and long-term goals, each should be provided with a timetable or a series of milestones so that management and its various constituencies can determine progress toward their attainment. They should be written as we actually plan: with easy, natural speech and with the assumption that they can be changed <u>without</u> <u>censure</u> when evidence requires it or when what seemed like a good idea turns out not to be so good after all.

The planning papers should be complete: nothing should be held back unless so ordered by superiors outside the Library or Library management determines that personal harm would result from such disclosures. They should be timely: written revisions should be made at the actual time when changes are decided upon and not saved for some formal presentation. They should be written to invite response: a measure of humility in undertaking the complex responsibility of planning invites staff comments and suggestions. They should be presented as management's commitment to the staff: as an opening up of potential decisions to all those affected by them with an invitation to respond. They should encourage mutual commitment: they should identify and enhance the awareness of our common interest in the excellence of service

programs upon which the Library's survival depends. They should educate both management and staff about the necessity of cooperative achievement: they should match the programmatic vision of management with the realities which staff must face in carrying out such visions. They should explain: they should make apparent the rationale for the Library's management structure, its staffing patterns and its assignments of duties.

The planning papers should be distributed to all library employees. They should be discussed at all-staff meetings, and at orientation sessions for new employees. And the planning decisions, when made, should evidence serious consideration of all that has been said or written in the advisory process prior to such decisions.

A decade from now, we would expect that the planning we are recommending would have become natural, challenging, non-threatening, and informative. In order to attain such an ease with good planning, many years of practice will be required, as will the encouragement of the kind of innovative thinking that may produce failure as well as success.

Among the current barriers to the acceptance of coordinated public planning is the tacit acceptance of the proposition that private planning is the only safe planning, the assumption that Library departments must operate competitively, the existence of evidence that aggressiveness and manipulation is rewarded and, finally, the conclusion that the integrity of the system is not operating, so that it's everyone for himself. Other barriers include the view that planning is management's business, and that as such the involvement of staff in the planning process is tantamount to asking non-management to do management's work. In turn this supports the comfortable illusion that the Library's troubles are management's fault, thus providing a convenient but organizationally pathological escape from responsibilty for the work environment.

All the barriers characterized in the paragraph above, the OCS Task Force believes, can be overcome by exemplary leadership and the unambiguous spelling out of expectations by this Library's Administrative Team. We suggest that during the first year or so, planning documents that cover issues of broad administrative scope be the only ones produced. During this time, the Library should offer courses or seminars on goal-oriented planning and its assessment. Then, gradually, in subsequent years, the requirement would be broadened to include the production of coordinated, public planning documents at the subdivision or unit level. The expectation that such documents meet the highest quality standards of planning should then be made explicit. At this time, the Administrative Team should be fully prepared to back up its words.

With the production of coordinated planning papers, the review and commentary by the staff should be at two to three levels: Library-wide planning, subdivision or second-tier planning, and unit or third-tier planning. With repeated involvement, the general level of sophistication and communication of concerns or interest should increase appreciably. As a final caveat the quality of the planning effort must be maintained by the top management team. The first hint of game-playing, hidden agendas and other attacks against the integrity of the process can quickly destroy any gains in managerial excellence, communication and morale that have been produced by sharing the planning process. Such maneuverings will need to be dealt with quickly, unambiguously and decisively.

Sources: Bengston and Shields; Jones; Waldhart

****

RECOMMENDATION II. That, within the next five years, the public services of the UCSB Library be reorganized into the following components: 1. the Humanities Information Center, 2. the Social Sciences Information Center, 3. the Pure and Applied Sciences Information Center, 4. an experimental Special Collections Client-centered Group, and 5. an experimental Map and Imagery Client-centered Group. That, concurrent with the establishment of these five components: A. all original catalogers and the responsibility for original cataloging be transferred to the three Information Centers and the two Client-Centered Groups, and B. an integrated Technical Processing Department be established which will be concerned with all non-subject oriented functions from placement of an order through the circulation of any information package acquired by the Library.

Discussion: This discussion section is organized into two parts. The first section is a description of the public services structures which are proposed. The second section is an investigation of the reasons for these proposed structures. There, we will be concerned with the reason why the structure should be the outcome of a series of planned goals, and why the planned goals are a reasonable response to the environmental changes we postulated in the Introduction above.

Recommendation II proposes a complete reorganization of the Library's public services. It includes the transfer of circulation, reserve book room and interlibrary loan activities into a Technical Services Department, and the establishment of original cataloging as a legitimate part of the public services performed by the newly structured Centers and Groups. As such, it deploys those who work with the subject content of information into organizational structures which deal exclusively with information in this manner. Moreover, it establishes an integrated Technical Services Department, organized into

hierarchical, function-defined units, each of which has as its overriding objective the efficient acquisition and preparation of information as a commodity or product.

Recommendation II proposes the establishment of three Information Centers. They would be stripped of any technical processing activities as defined in the paragraph above. Such Centers would serve as replacements for the four reference departments currently operating, namely, the Reference Department, Sciences-Engineering Library, Arts Library and Government Publications Department. The new Centers would be located in the environment of their appropriate subject collections. At the professional level they would be staffed by subject specialists, each with a common cluster of competencies (e.g., for the Humanities Information Center, each subject specialist would evidence significant and current education in one or more of the humanities taught on this campus) complemented by other competencies which may be either unique within the center (e.g., individual subject specialities) or shared by a subset of the Center's employees (e.g., competency in original cataloging).

Since the subject divisions proposed are large, their associated collections would be housed on multiple floors. It follows that that there would not necessarily be one large central office for each Center. Instead the library office of each subject specialist would normally be located on the floor where most of the primary collections relevant to her/his speciality could be found. (Subject specialists, as well as others, know that allied subject collections -- often needed by researchers in a specific subject more urgently than the materials in their primary collections -- are scattered throughout the Library's classifications. Thus we see the importance of working in a physically unified library rather than in scattered buildings.) One central office would be established for each Center. There, the Library user would find the office of the subject specialist serving as the Chair of the Center, the support staff for the Center (normally managed by a senior member of the classified staff who reports to the Chair), the Center's reference services office, occupied according to a scheduled time by the subject specialists of the Center, and an information service referral desk serving as one of a series of directional switching stations, reception desks and appointment centers. Reference desks, as we now know them, would be displaced by the three types of information work stations described above. Thus, once a library user has arrived at the information referral desk of the appropriate Center, s(he) would either be directed to a subject specialist's office, provided an appointment had been made, or to the generalist and short answer duty office. If the information needs are of a generalist nature or can be answered relatively quickly (as is the case for most queries in an academic research library) the subject specialist on temporary duty in the Center's reference services office would supply the information in

computer or printed form. If, on the other hand, the information needs require in-depth work, the use of specialized software, or significant subject background, the subject specialist on duty would refer the library user to the information referral desk. There, after calling up the subject specialist's calendar on the computer display screen, the library user would be referred immediately to the subject specialist's Library office or other offices in the academic Department where s(he) also works, or an appointment could be made by entering the client's name and information need into the schedule database.

In order to operate in the manner described, each center would need to provide generous, individual offices for each subject specialist. These offices should be of a size capable of housing several computer work stations, each with its associated peripherals, the necessary software, the support documents, and a number of optical discs on which databases are located. Each office should be enclosed to shut out noise and to allow voice levels normal to conversation to be used by the subject specialist and the clients. (This arrangement would also solve the sometimes acute noise problems resulting from mixing study and reference areas in the Library as it is currently done.) One computer work station would be a terminal requiring cabling for dedication to the campus central computer facilities and for data transmission to remote terminals of clientele on other parts of the campus. Another computer work station would be a mini-computer functioning as a backup, should central computing systems go down, and for accessing databases not on library-owned optical disks. The office would also include an oversize desk sufficient to consult a number of documents simultaneously including printouts. In addition it would include at least one fairly large table sufficient for small group consultation with data printouts.

The proposed structure of three Information Centers would work best with the newly constructed space of the Library addition currently under discussion. Without it, the two separate fine arts collections and their users would need to put up with the disadvantages of the physical separation of both their materials and subject specialists from the cross-disciplinary interactions with allied collections and subject specialists in the Main Library. Fortunately, computer accessibility to large, common data files and the capacity for networking would lessen these disadvantages and reduce the parochialism usually associated with physical isolation.

The proposed client-centered groups, namely the Special Collections Department and the Map and Imagery Laboratory, are transdisciplinary in both collections and public service operations. Both provide curatorial and technical services beyond that common to that of Centers. In addition to these

traits, their relatively small staffs and their highly specialized work with well-defined target groups make them good candidates to explore the advantages of the client-centered structure.

Proposals for client-centered organizations in any library are conceptually locked to the writing of Charles Martell, Jr. This prolific and inventive author has written many articles, a dissertation and a book on this type of organizational model for academic research libraries. In all these writings his ideas have evolved while certain clusters of concepts have remained constant. As such, we will need to make some distinctions. We are recommending that certain portions of his model be adopted as prototype experiments by which this Library can investigate the functioning of such groups, their effectiveness in delivering innovative information products, and the work satisfaction that derives from them. Experimenting with transdisciplinary, special service departments such as MIL and Special Collections will allow this Library to reduce the risks of extreme parochialism likely to be associated with a very specialized Client-centered Group (for example, a robotics Client-centered Group) and, at the same time, to avoid exclusive concentration on only the research segment of this Library's clientele (again this would be exemplified in a robotics Client-centered Group). In the meantime, information on a much more ambitious use of the client-centered concept at the University of Illinois should become available.

The characteristics which are proposed to distinguish further these two Client-centered Groups are as follows: 1. Each academic appointee would provide advanced reference, collection development, computerized searching, library instruction, original cataloging, and other information services. 2. Evaluation of the success or failure of the group's efforts would be heavily dependent on client feedback. 3. Interaction between the subject specialist and the client would be custom-designed to the requirements of the situation and at a level requiring deep subject background and/or advanced skills with computer programs. 4. Managerial roles in both planning and execution would emphasize team-leader type coordination of activities as opposed to the classic, hierarchical boss who gives orders to subordinates who then report back the results of their directed activities. 5. Powers to plan, budget, allocate resources and manage support staff would be broadly delegated to the group by the Library Administration. 6. Technical processing functions in support of the groups would be custom designed in the Technical Services Department to suit the needs of the client-centered groups. (adapted from Martell, p. 73)

We turn now to the reasons for the proposed establishment of the three Information Centers. They implement, in part, two proposed objectives for public services at the UCSB Library. They are:

1. to provide equitable levels of services for all subjects taught or researched on this campus. Since the middle 60's, the Sciences and the Fine Arts segment of the humanities have been able to provide carefully targeted, increasingly sophisticated levels of service based on: a) a well-defined, subject-specific clientele, b) the capacity to work conveniently with their collections, and c) the assignment of subject specialties which united collection development with conventional reference work, computer searching and instruction. The proposed establishment of divisional libraries for the Social Sciences and the remainder of the Humanities would create the same needed infrastructure, the same successful combination of duties and the same clarity of assignments for public services that those academic departments in the Sciences and Fine Arts have enjoyed for more than two decades.

2. to prepare the UCSB Library to compete effectively in the provision of manual and automated information services to the academic community. The work stations proposed for the three Information Centers provide the space, quiet, and equipment needed for significantly increased interaction with the computer as postulated on pages 10-11 of the Introduction. The space is needed for frequent, sequential consultation with clients, documentation and machines which provide the needed information. The quiet is needed because both the work and verbal feedback are intricate as well as intellectually demanding. The equipment is needed for each subject specialist because interaction with it will consume the greater part of each subject specialist's day. Such frequency of use rules out sharing any other than the most exotic equipment.

The reasons for recommending the two client-centered groups have been stated above within the explanatory portion proposal. The further creation of client-centered groups as spinoffs of the proposed Information Centers must, as we see it, remain a function of two parameters: a. the degree to which client-centered groups prove to be a better library response than the Information Centers to the need for innovative, <u>custom-designed</u> services and b. the degree to which they prove to be a better library response than the Information Centers to the need for access to <u>mainstream</u> verbal and numeric information. The establishment of the two proposed client-centered groups within this library will provide the local data needed for the first parameter. The experience of other Libraries, such as the University of Illinois, will provide abundant information for the second parameter. Whatever the outcome, the Information Centers can serve as the source of new, Client-centered Groups or as an organization to which personnel can return from Client-centered Groups which have not found a clientele that consistently needs their services.

The impediments to a phased, five year establishment of the three Information Centers and the two Client-centered Groups, as the public services management structure in this library are psychological, financial, and educational. The proposals involve significant change and it is only human to avoid change, if the current environment is sufficiently comfortable. The major problems with such thinking are two: 1. the current environment is comfortable, in the main, for those who remain in historically protected positions, while that same environment is becoming distinctly uncomfortable for those who provide the direct services, and 2. it assumes that change can be avoided. This latter notion is naive, if our postulates are correct. Change in the functions, the input, and the output of academic research libraries will be both great and rapid during the next ten years. The choice then is not whether to avoid change. Rather it is whether to flow intelligently with it or be swept away uncontrollably by its force. The financial problem involves both space and the cost of rearranging parts of the Library. A detailed discussion of these implications is beyond the scope of this recommendation. Suffice it to say that at this time financial problems are far fewer than they have been during the last two decades within the University of California. As for the space problems associated with Recommendation II, the effective use of that currently available remains a matter of planning, priorities (which may involve local storage as a supplement to remote storage, and the conversion of areas outside the Library into study halls), and ingenuity. Newly constructed space that is likely to be added promises to be more than adequate for the proposed reorganization. The education required for such changes as proposed in Recommendation II will be both substantial and sustained. This will include updating training in the disciplines which are to be served by these Centers as well as a re-orientation toward the use of computers and their software as a major means of access to information in both its primary and secondary forms.

Sources: Bryan; Johnson; Martell

****

RECOMMENDATION III. That all public service librarians be assigned the duties of subject specialists, and, as such, be prepared to use a basic repertoire of abilities and skills to include: A. a generalist's knowledge of the basic services and tools (including databases) offered in each of the Information Centers; B. a skilled, working knowledge of the services and major tools (including databases) of each discipline serviced by the Center or Client-centered Groups; and, C. an in-depth understanding of all the components, interests and lines of inquiry of at least one discipline taught at this campus such that (s)he serves as the Library's resource person for collection building and all other advanced services including full, professional level interaction with all databases relevant to that discipline.

Discussion: The campus of a large university provides for three broad types of client information needs.

First, at the basic level, there is the client need for introductory information which provides an overview sufficiently stepped down from the advanced teaching and research complexities that it permits an amateur's understanding of the subject. Frequently, these clients are undergraduates enrolled for their first course in a subject. Equally often, they are individuals working outside their major field, or else staff employed outside the library. Following common usage, we call this large and heterogeneous group the generalists. Their needs in an academic research library are distinctive because a. their subject information needs are at such a level of generality that they often cover more than one of the major divisions of knowledge, and b. their understanding of information retrieval tools and their selection is usually at a elementary level. During the '70's, the undergraduate library was created to serve the needs of the generalist. The literature indicates that at best undergraduate libraries have not been cost-effective (Rudolph, G. A. in Person, Roland p. 9), and at worst, they deprived " . . . the undergraduate of a learning experience that only a large research library can offer."(Wingate, p. 33)

The second level is for advanced teaching information needs. Here we are concerned with access to the classic research monographs and articles, the treatises, the Advances in . . ., the Progress in . . ., etc.. Typically, these are the research interests of advanced undergraduates, beginning graduates or faculty who are beginning serious research outside their field. Formerly these were the bread-and-butter information needs supplied by that institution known as the "Reference Librarian". Here, a good knowledge of the card catalog, the serials list, and relevant abstracts or indexes was sine qua non, and the reference librarian with superb recall of all the intricate relationships among such finding tools was equally indispensable. With the coming of computer access to the collections of libraries, and the availability of most of those abstracts and indexes in automated form, the recall of the classic reference librarian has been transferred to the subtleties of the well-constructed search strategy, and with it, a much deeper involvement in the subjects of the research itself.

The third level of need is, of course, that of information for the advanced researcher. In former decades, the reference librarian was normally content to decipher strange journal abbreviations or perhaps point out the latest updating changes in a choice abstract or index. The revolution of the '70's was the use of the librarian as the designer of a sophisticated net of logical strategy for capturing information needed by the advanced researcher. That of the late '80's may remain the same, although

the more straightforward information needs of the advanced researcher may be better served by direct access thereby bypassing the librarian intermediary through use of the search aid software now becoming popular.

Now that we have outlined the three general levels of information needs, we turn to the core proposal of Recommendation III. The proposal is that all three information needs be served equally well by each subject specialist. Thus, at the generalist level, all subject specialists would be held accountable for providing this level of information. In most cases, it would be provided directly, since terminals accessing such information via the library catalog, basic full-text reference sources or popular magazine indexing databases will be available throughout the library. Thus, someone at the Science Information Center should be as comfortable in helping a student with an elementary research paper on Van Gogh's life as the subject specialist at the Humanities Information Center should be comfortable in teaching how to get a popular book on Einstein's theory of relativity. The insistence that such competencies be spread throughout the library and that such services be a high priority is based on the need to meet the type of criticism that generated the undergraduate library. Upon implementation of these proposals, we would expect: 1) that undergraduates or others with elementary information needs would not have to be referred from one corner of the library to another to satisfy their needs; 2) that undergraudates would enjoy equal service priority with that given to more the advanced user, and 3) that one-to-one teaching needs for this type of clientele would never again fall between the cracks of bureaucratic organization charts.

The respective Information Centers would be chiefly responsible for providing advanced teaching level information needs. Within each Information Center, each subject specialist would be held accountable for accessing any subject considered a primary responsibility for that Center. Thus, those librarians in the Humanities Information Center would service any information need at the advanced teaching level for literature, philosophy, religion, art, music, etc. At this level, subject specialists would be working primarily with students enrolled for upper division and graduate courses exclusive of the seminar level, which for brevity we will call the advanced teaching level.

The third level would be assigned to an individual subject specialist, for which s(he) assumed exclusive responsibility or at least a shared responsibility with a backup librarian. At this level the expecations would be for imaginative applications of very advanced competencies involving a cluster of databases germane to a given discipline and a thorough understanding of the structure and general content of the relevant printed collections. Thus each subject specialist would have three coequal service

responsibilities: to all students at the generalist level, to all students wanting advanced teaching level information for the subjects handled by her/his center, and to those in advanced research who need information within the particular subject(s) for which s(he) bears exclusive subject specialist duties.

Such changes in the expectations and programs which this library develops for the subject specialist will require different sequences of training i.e., some will require subject background training as well as training in computer access of information; others will require either subject background training or computer training but not both. A maximum of five years should be alloted to bring all public service librarians up to minimal programmatic expectations. In addition, those within the Information Centers will need continuous updating in the knowledge and skills required to provide for generalist information demands. A year-round series of seminars given at least once a month on topics of current general interest, methods of searching for the information, and reviews of useful publications and/or bibliographies would seem to be a minimal ways to maintain such currency. Attendance and participation at such seminars must be mandatory, providing basic service is maintained at each Center. A parallel series of year round seminars will need to be provided within the Centers in order to update abilities and skills at the advanced teaching level for those disciplines handled by the Center's subject specialists. For the specialist competencies, the Library will need to fund generously the necessary time for travel to specialist meetings, or seminars, and for continued education in the fields of speciality.

Obstacles to the accomplishment of such competencies include fear of change which was discussed under Recommendation II, parochialism and a somewhat laid-back lifestyle which is observable here and there. A clear articulation of goals and objectives, a firm statement of expectations, the resolve to enforce such, and the necessary vision and encouragement on the part of management should do much to solve such problems.

Sources: Person, Roland; Windgate

****

RECOMMENDATION IV. That the ideal staffing patterns of subject-specialists for the three Information Centers and the two Client-centered Groups be derived from a formula-driven base then modified by empirical factors. That the base formula be driven by the number of academic departments served by each information center; that the empirical factors to be used to subtract or add to the base formula include: evidence of minimal or above average

need for library staff by a department, the existence of programs or organized research units which heavily use library services, or evidence of significantly above average size of departments. That the ideal subject specialist staffing patterns for each information center be calculated by multiplying one FTE subject specialist by the empirically modified formula. That the actual subject specialist staffing pattern be calculated by converting the empirical formula products to decimal factors and multiplying them by the total library allocated subject specialist FTE. Deviations from the products will be redressed on a priority scale based on the degree of deviation of a given Center or Group from the optimal staffing pattern.

Discussion: The attempts to create an objective method of staffing are legion. Intuitively we know that staffing should be based on workload and that workload in turn is somehow related, for academic research libraries, to such objective variables as number of faculty or students. A well researched example of this method for staffing is a study completed in 1979 at the University of Illinois (Renner and Clark). The study found that six empirically derived factors accounted for variations in total staff size within the thirty departmental libraries studied. These were: the number of faculty served; the number of instruction units taught; the average number of hours the library is open per week; the number of volumes circulated per year; the collections budget and the number of volumes in the libraries.

Although, typically, this study confirms our intuitive feelings about the factors that determine workload and their justifiable connection to staffing patterns, three caveats are applicable. First, the formula is based on existing staffing patterns at the University of Illinois; as such, it fails to justify the proposition that the existing staffing patterns to which the objective patterns were fitted were in themselves justifiable. Secondly, the formula is for departmental libraries of which UCSB has none (Arts is a small divisional library for two disciplines), and as such is not applicable. Thirdly, the data upon which the formula is based are at least six years old and thus fail to account for the significant changes in work loads brought about by automated technical processing and the much wider use of database searching in the public services. As such, it is out of date. Such problems with formulas are nearly universal, and the unfortunate consequences of choosing between them and an equally unpalatable staffing pattern based on historical accidents and/or negotiations is well explored in a paper by Vasi. What then to do? First, as proposed, use a formula that is locally based. Secondly, as proposed, in determining subject specialist allocations allow the formula to be empirically modified annually. Thirdly, as proposed, let the empirically modified formula be further changed by overall staffing patterns of librarians as determined by planning performed by the library's management team.

The implementation of such staffing patterns for subject specialists would require a close tracking of workload effects by various academic departments, programs and Organized Research Units. The justifications for changing the formulas would be submitted annually, thus putting an additional workload on the management team for whom we have already recommended considerable planning of objectives, goals and priorities. Nevertheless the fit among those programs proposed in Recommendation I, this Recommendation, and Recommendations IV and V is good in that they re-enforce and complement one another. The sequence recommended for implementation parallels that of Recommendation I.

The impediments to the implementation of this recommendation include, once again, resistance to change, lack of training, and fear of losing staff under a modified formula approach. Once again comments previously made about change apply here as does the recommendation that explicit expectations from library management be required in concert with the provision of sufficient training and support programs.

Sources: Renner and Clark; Vasi

****

RECOMMENDATION V. That the support staff segment for each of the three proposed information centers and the two Client-oriented Groups be based on an empirical, programatically justified proposal that is under zero-based review no less than every five years.

Discussion: By a zero-based review of a programmatically justified proposal, we mean the production of a total staffing plan for the Centers and Groups indicated, using a priority ranking of the programs along with their proposed staff components including the amount and level of FTE required, the function to be performed by FTE and the justification for the work itself. The literature often associates zero-based budgeting with severe budget reductions or crude, quantitative input-output measurements in which least cost is the dominant criterion for accepting proposed programs, e. g., Boyd; Fincher. However as Boyd points out (Boyd, p. 438): "Zero-base budgetting, or any other properly used budget technique, does not preclude the use of subjective measures. When quality and excellence are important parameters, quantitative factors alone will not always suffice." That which is important to accomplish in zero-based budgeting is the total priority review of library programs in the public services which require the use of support staff. These proposals would be produced by middle management every five years, and the final decisions by the library administration on programmatic priorities to be funded would be widely publicized

in the interests of communication and morale. It should be noted that we distinguish staffing of subject specialists as externally driven by academic programmatic planning, and therefore better handled by an externally driven formula modified by empirical justifications (which are also subject to review). The additional public service programs which the library wishes to accomplish would be based on library determined priorities in response to the perceived needs of the academic community.

We propose that zero-based budgets for the components indicated should be introduced only after providing thorough training in preparing such staffing proposals. This budgeting could begin prior to the establishment of the Centers and Groups. The obstacles to implementation are once again the difficulties of the planning process as detailed in previous discussions above. Its success, if adopted, would depend greatly on the articulation of expectations, the communication of clear and predictable penalties for game-playing, and the Library's willingness to make significant investments in training and consultation by planning experts.

Sources: Boyd; Fincher; Hayton

****

RECOMMENDATION VI. That management of the three Information Centers and the Client-centered Groups be assigned by the University Librarian for five year terms, ordinarily not renewable other than in exceptional circumstances.

The role of public services middle management in today's academic research libraries is quite often not a happy one. On one hand, they are held responsible for the quality of services so specialized in subject content and software skills that they can not ordinarily be taught nor basically understood by the middle manager. As a consequence, middle management's evaluation of subject specialists and even the assignments of new duties has become increasingly dependent on responses from the clientele served by the subject specialist or by peers performing comparable duties at other academic research libraries. On the other hand, these same middle managers are held responsible for implementing the efficient use of complex, multifunctional, automated systems which were designed with cost-efficient tradeoffs for the library as a whole even though such a system may provide some significant disadvantages for the operations of individual units. As if this were not enough, they are held responsible for the career development and updating of duties and skills necessary for staff to stay ahead or at least keep abreast of esoteric, technology-induced changes in information access. Clearly, there is a strong element of catch-22 in the assignment of responsibilities for the quality of services which s(he) can not fully understand and systems which s(he) did not elect.

Although there are articles of outstanding quality on the role of middle management in the academic research library (Ackerman; Dunlap; Moran), they do not explicitly study the role of public services middle management in the scenario sketched above. Nevertheless, a key can be found in an amalgam of Ackerman's discussion on modifying the hierarchy (p. 21-22), Dunlap's discussion of staff organization and management planning (p. 402-404) and Moran's discussion of modified bureaucratic structures (p. 142-142). They characterize the responsibilities of middle management as planners and implementors of plans, as those who invite and respond to advice, as those who provide advice, as those who evaluate personnel by judging the evaluations of the evaluators. Actually, our proposal to assign the responsibilities just discussed and to dismiss accountability for the performance of the unit's academic personnel and the success of Library-wide programs is not as novel a proposal as it might seem at first. Such a role for public services middle management has been well tested in another structure, namely that of academic department governance within the University of California. (We hasten to add that we are not proposing faculty status for librarians, nor stipends for middle management. We enjoy the results of a very wise decision whereby those who participate in the subject discipline side of the University's enterprise but do not bear the primary burden of teaching and research are classified as academic.) What we are proposing is that the functions of middle management in the public services be changed: that the performance of duties made impossible by the developments of knowledge itself and the computer's access to it be removed, and that in place of it the duties of the departmental chair, as sketched above, be substituted. Middle management as a speciality in the public services thus becomes obsolete. It becomes a temporary, assigned duty. We recognize that just as in academic departments where there exist reasons for not assigning managerial responsibilities to many of the faculty so will it be in the Library. Thus we should be understood as not recommending mechanical rotation of middle management responsibilities nor the kind of collegial, group decision-making that was current a decade ago.

Sources: Ackerman; Dunlap; Moran

****

RECOMMENDATION VII. That the advisory body to the Administrative Team be a Council composed of the Associate AUL (Chair), other AUL's as appropriate, the Chairs of the three Information Centers, one or more representatives from the Client-Oriented Groups, and the head of the Technical Services Department. That the Council meet at least monthly, and that it be divided into standing working committees which investigate and recommend on library-wide integrated planning and implementation for the three functional sectors of the Library: collection development,

technical services and public services. That the membership of these working committees include additional members appointed for fixed terms by the University Librarian on the advice of the Council.

Discussion: Dunlap (p. 403) and Moran (p. 141) make the point that the establishment of investigatory and advisory groups on library management matters are far more than mere genuflections toward the professionalism of librarians. Indeed, we may say, their establishment is required by the complexity of the information environment, the speciality knowledge that is needed to comprehend its various parts, and the fact that the overview necessary to make recommendations of library-wide scope demands mastery of so many fields of inquiry that no one individual can be expected to command them. The advisory structure proposed brings together public service chairs and team-leaders with the head of a postulated Technical Service Department which encompasses all computer integrated production work from order initiation through circulation. The Council as a whole would dedicate a majority of its time to the consideration of recommendations resulting from issues that had been thoroughly investigated by its subcommittees. As the central planning body on library-wide issues its recommendations would be made to the University Librarian.

The time frame for the establishment of the Council would coincide with the establishment of the the Information Centers and the Client-centered Groups. The impediments to its effective operation will be the newness of the function, the considerable stress of all library personnel in establishing a new library organization, and the lack of experience on the part of most of the members in working with long range, library-wide planning techniques and tools.

Sources: Dunlap; Moran

****

SUMMARY

The function of the seven recommendations just presented has been to suggest some rational responses to a postulated future library environment of which we presume to know some of the characteristics. In so doing we have tried to follow four basic designs. The first design provides for the primary division of the library's functions: it uses functions requiring knowledge of the academic subjects taught on campus to distinguish the proper activities of the public services from that of the technical services where no such understanding is required. Using the second design, our proposals distinguish responsibilities

appropriate to academic classifications from those appropriate to support staff classifications by assigning subject specialist responsibilities to academic classifications alone. Using the third design, we have introduced a form of collegiality which makes its peace with the necessity for hierarchy. This is incorporated in the governance of the Information Centers and the Client-centered Groups, in the structure of the Council, and in the communication and participation in all the planning processes. Finally, and fourth, the design of the planning process itself -- including a formula/empirical-driven staffing pattern for subject specialists and the zero-budgeted staffing patterns for classified staff -- is for the purpose of structuring the library and demanding of its services a planned, intelligent response to the immense waves of change in information access that are upon us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Page, "Governance and Academic Libraries", Library Research, 2, (1), p. 3-28

Bengston, Dale Susan and Dorothy Shields, "A Test of Marchant's Predictive Formulas Involving Job Satisfaction," Journal of Academic Librarianship, 11, (2), 1985, p 88-92

Boyd, William L., "Zero-Base Budgeting; The Texas Experience", Journal of Higher Education, 53, (4), p. 427-438

Bryan, Harrison, "Trends in Staff Organization in Large Academic Libraries", in: Studies in Library Management, 5, 1979, p. 42-65

Dunlap, Connie R., "Organizational Patterns in Academic Libraries, 1876-1976", College and Research Libraries, 37, (5), p. 395-407

Fincher, Camerson, "The Lust for Efficiency: A Downhome Story or the Implications of Zero-Based Budgeting for Institutions of Higher Educations as Seen from the State of Georgia's Experience", ERIC Document ED 181793

Hayton, Elise, "Zero Base Budgeting in a University Library", Special Libraries, 71, (3), 1980, p. 169-176

Johnson, Edward R., "Subject-divsional Organization in American University Libraries, 1939-1974", The Library Quarterly, 47, (1), 1977, p. 23-42

Jones, K. H., "The Objectives Approach to the Management of Libraries and Information Departments", in: Studies in Library Management, 5, 1979, p 69-91

Martell, Charles R., Jr. The Client-Centered Academic Library: An Organizational Model, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983

Mockler, Robert J., "Situational Theory of Management", Harvard Business Review, 49, May-June 1971, p. 147 as quoted in: Martell, Charles, "Administration: Which Way--Traditional Practice of Modern Theory?", The Management Process: A Selection of Readings for Librarians, Chicago: American Library Association, 1983.

Person, Roland, ed., "University Undergraduate Libraries: Nearly Extinct or Continuing Examples of Evolution? A Symposium", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 8, (1), p. 4-13

Person, Ruth J., "Organizing", The Management Process: A Selection of Readings for Librarians, Chicago: American Library Association, 1983. p. 179-181

Redfern, Margaret, "'Managing the People Part': the Changing Climate of Personnel Administration", in: Studies in Library Management, 6, 1980, p. 177-194v

Renner, Charlene and Barton M. Clark, "Professional and Nonprofessional Staffing Patterns in Departmental Libraries, Library Research, 1, p 153-170

Vasi, John, Budget Allocation Systems for Research Libraries, Occasional Paper Number 7, Washington, D. C.: Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries, 1983

Waldhart, Thomas J., Implementing Results-Oriented Management in Academic Libraries", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, (4), p. 209-213

Wingate, Henry W., "The Undergraduate Library: Is it Obsolete?", College and Research Libraries, 39, (1), p. 29-33

GOAL II
OCS SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIRING PRACTICES,
TRAINING AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

An examination of the objectives for Goal II of the OCS action plan presented our subcommittee with the realization that, given its human resources and the time frame of the report, it could not realistically conduct an in-depth analysis of these topics. A survey of the literature shows that a subject such as career development, be it staff career development or professional development, is better addressed by a separate task force. (SPEC Kits 18, 75, 86, Martell and Dougherty, p. 154) Consequently, our recommendations tend to be very general. A further examination of the literature and an informal discussion with a member of the Technology Task Force has re-emphasized our awareness of the need for a staff with more flexible attitudes and abilities who can adapt to the future changes resulting from the applications of the new technology.

Through a series of informal discussions with the AUL-Personnel and by examining campus and library documents, we were able to better perceive the complexities involved in the recruitment process, many of which are not generally known to staff members. We also learned what exists and what is lacking with regard to programs for staff sharing and career development. We spoke to the AUL-Services to gain some insights into the Administration's perception about future formal staff development programs.

Based on this methodology and an indication of interest in career development and retraining activities mentioned in the OCS Questionnaire, particularly in the open ended portion, we have attempted to bridge the gap between present and future practices through the following recommendations.

RECRUITMENT PRACTICES

Current UCSB Library recruitment practices for all series of employees appear to be fairly standard when compared to similar ARL (Association of Research Libraries) institutions. (SPEC Kit, no. 78, Oct. 1981.) Affirmative action requirements provide for safeguards in hiring, yet, at the same time, can delay the process because of the additional procedures which must be followed. Other constraints are related to delays caused by the Library's need to meet a salary savings quota and the additional time to be allowed in advertising nationally, as is the case in hiring academic employees. Other problems relate to hiring from the outside rather than promoting from within; lack of overlap in vacancies so that cross training cannot be given to the incumbent; recruiting at the lowest step in the series which can result in losing the best qualified candidates; no thorough re-examination of vacancies to provide better utilization of duties; disappearance of vacant positions from staffing patterns without any explanation and lack of effective publicity in alerting staff personnel to vacancies existing in the Library, on

campus, and at other state institutions.

Most of these issues are too complex to examine in the time given our subcommittee, so we have elected to address some very superficially, if at all, and only in a few instances, to make some specific recommendations. The fact that they are mentioned, we hope, should provide some incentive to the Library Administration to address them at a later time.

Our main concerns are for the future service needs of the academic library. We are making recommendations which should better prepare the Library to have employees equipped with the necessary skills and aptitudes to meet the challenges of the future.

RECOMMENDATION 1. (0-2 years)

The Library should establish an overall, written set of goals and objectives, with a revised set of priorities.

Discussion: Once the aforementioned goals, objectives and priorities have been determined, a clearer picture should emerge of the following: 1) the functions which are essential to deliver optimum service; 2) the skills and expertise which will be required of library employees to fulfill these functions; and 3) the areas of the Library which will require special expertise or additional staff to perform the functions.

RECOMMENDATION 2. (0-5 years)

As the goals, objectives and priorities statements are being developed, the Library should have the following conducted: 1) a skills inventory and assessment of its human resources, and 2) a library-wide job audit of all positions.

Discussion: Both of these surveys can be construed as fact finding endeavors. The skills assessment should identify the strengths and weaknesses of the present staff. It should also solicit information on the types of duties employees would like to be performing. Several comments in Part II, Section C of the OCS Questionnaire were supportive of such inventories or assessments. It should attempt to discover employee interest in acquiring expertise essential to performing these duties or in improving performance. Such an assessment should be conducted under the auspicies of the Library Personnel Office, with a committee consisting of equal representatives of both series of library employees assisting. The assessment should be in survey form, with the results kept online to be updated to include information acquired from new employees and to delete information when employees leave.

The library wide job audit would provide information on whether job responsibilities are performed at the appropriate levels and whether certain positions will require a change, combination, or reassignment of duties. To insure the element of objectivity, we strongly recommend that the services of an outside consultant or agency, exclusive of the campus personnel office, perform the audit. It would be very desirable that the agent/agency have

experience and knowledge of library organization and operations. The consultant(s) must have access to all the essential campus and library personnel documents needed to conduct the audit.

These two studies, which could serve as tools for planning possible reorganization, should provide the Library with vital information on how its human resources are presently deployed and how they could be more advantageously used in the future.

RECOMMENDATION 3. (0-10 years)

From the information gained from the skills assessment and job audit, the library should conduct an ongoing, comprehensive review and analysis of staff utilization.

Discussion: Whereas the purpose of the skills assessment and job audits was primarily to gather information, the purpose of the review and analysis is evaluative, e.g., Are employees using their skills and talents effectively in their jobs? As positions become vacant, each should be re-examined to determine its importance in the context of library priorities. The Library now conducts exit interviews for academic employees. One of the purposes of this interview is to solicit suggestions from the departing librarian which will aid in evaluating the position he/she is vacating. This is followed by a staff planning conference, at which appropriate personnel meet to determine whether to fill, abolish, reorganize the job, or to convert it to another series. (Procedures of Appointment and Review, Librarian Series, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1981.)

The Library should consider expanding this process to include exit interviews and staff planning conferences for its support staff. In order to be effective, these must be conducted in a timely manner, ideally as soon as a vacancy is known. Initially, these might involve a considerable commitment of time on the part of the Library Administration, Dept. Heads and supervisors. However, as more positions are examined and perhaps reconstructed the time commitment should be less.

RECOMMENDATION 4. (5-10 years)

Using the results of the preceding surveys, the Library should investigate the feasibility of hiring more staff in classifications other than the Librarian and Library Assistant series (e.g., bookkeepers working in Acquisitions, more office managers rather than LA's in departments, more programmers, a communications coordinator, etc.). It should also consider the option for recruiting personnel for more split assignment appointments (working in two or more departments).

Discussion: Hiring more staff in other classifications would provide the Library with a pool of employees having the proper skill and expertise in jobs which require a minimum of library related knowledge.

The OCS Questionnaire results did not indicate high interest in split assignments (6.57 felt they were essential and 30.66% thought them desirable to meet future service demands.) However, some UCSB academic vacancies have already included a duties statement in the advertising which reads: "Other assignments of a professional nature to meet administrative requirements." This implies that, as priorities change, emphasis and opportunity in a given position may shift. Having employees with split assignments allows the organization the luxury of having the employees develop expertise which can be effectively utilized in one or more operations. It also provides for a more flexible structure rather than the traditional one of functional units or departments. Conversely, it can cause stress as an employee attempts to meet all the expectations of the multiple jobs equally well, plus cope with conflicting schedules and different managerial styles. Department Heads and/or supervisors may lack the proper understanding of the demands put upon the individual. If the Library Administration favors these types of assignments, they must make it clear to middle managers some of the complexities inherent in the split assignment.

Recruitment is but one phase of an overall plan for staffing, because once the employee is hired, activities such as proper orientation, training, retraining, career development and continuing education must be considered if the organization is to attract, develop, and keep library career employees. Before discussing these topics, we have elected to address some recommendations on recruitment which we formulated in response to some complaints and verbal comments which came to our attention. These are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION 5. (0-1 year)

The Library should consider forming ad hoc search committees for librarians earlier in the recruiting process, preferably at the time the advertisement appears in journals, rather than near or after the deadline for applications.

Discussion: One of the complaints voiced is that it takes so long to fill positions, especially in the academic series. We are aware that there are factors over which the Library has no control. However, if committees were formed sooner and could begin screening applications earlier, it would help speed up the interview process in some cases. The Library Personnel officer, working closely with the LAUC-SB Committee on Appointments, Assignments and Reassignments (CAAR) should strive for following a tighter time table in the recruitment process. It is also necessary that the appropriate department head or supervisory officer having the vacancy be involved.

RECOMMENDATION 6. (0-5 years)

The Library should investigate the utilization of electronic mail in the recruiting process.

Discussion: This should prove to be an effective way for speeding up recruitment procedures. Ads could be forwarded via electronic mail to the appropriate journals, with the documentation following by regular mail. In this way it is assured that the information has reached the journal in time for publication deadlines, maybe preventing a month's delay. Electronic mail can be used to correspond with the applicants and their references and for transmitting various personnel documents, with care taken that no affirmative action procedures are violated.

Another concern expressed to this subcommittee relates to the fact that staff personnel vacancies in the library, on campus and at other UC or state institutions are not sufficiently publicized.

RECOMMENDATION 7. (Immediately)

The Library Personnel Office should publicize more effectively employment opportunities existing for staff personnel.

Discussion: The bulletin board in the vicinity of the Library Personnel Office contains a substantial number of job vacancies, most of which are academic. At one end are posted employment listings for staff personnel including the campus document "UCSB Promotional and Employment Opportunities." However these are not clearly identified and could be overlooked. It would be simple to reserve a portion of the board with a clearly marked sign identifying these documents as vacancies for staff personnel. Department Heads should also be reminded to circulate or post in a prominent place the campus publication "UCSB Promotional and Employment Opportunities."

The Library Personnel Office should also provide appropriate

information on transferral of benefits to employees interested in job opportunities on other UC or California State campuses.

ORIENTATION, TRAINING, CROSS TRAINING, RETRAINING, STAFF SHARING, CONTINUING EDUCATION, CAREER DEVELOPMENT

For the purposes of this report all the above activities are considered necessary components for contributing to a staff development program.

ORIENTATION

Though not specifically mentioned in our objectives, the OCS Questionnaire had a number of comments regarding an orientation program, so we are briefly addressing this topic. Orientation is defined as a period of introduction and adjustment to a new environment. If done well, it can foster a positive attitude toward the institution and the job. The Library Administration has issued Library Policy Statement 85.5 (August 16, 1985) which delineates a formal orientation program (Appendix I, p. 44-48).

RECOMMENDATION 8. (0-2 years)

That the staff personnel orientation program currently being phased in be publicized widely and be evaluated periodically to determine its effectiveness.

Discussion: Since its introduction last fall, this phased orientation program is well underway yet not all Library employees are fully aware of it. Once all phases of the orientation cycle have been completed, the program should be evaluated to determine that its purposes have been achieved and to allow for expansion or revision of the orientation process. One method of evaluation could be a questionnaire sent to employees who have fully participated in the program, asking for comments and suggestions for enlargement or improvement. For example, the portion of the program pertaining to departmental visits could be expanded to incorporate demonstrations of functions such as online computer searching, cataloging via RLIN, etc. Since there is no formal orientation program for new academic employees, some attempt should be made to encourage newly appointed librarians to attend parts of the orientation program, especially such activities as the "quarterly orientation coffee" and the visits to Library departments.

RECOMMENDATION 9. (0-2 years)

That the Librarians Association of the University of California, Santa Barbara (LAUC-SB) provide a packet of information for new academic employees, which could include a revision of the Librarian's Handbook.

Discussion: Prior to their arrival on the job, new academic employees are sent information on the University, the community, employee benefits, etc. Some of this information is also conveyed to them during the interview. Within the first month of their arrival, the Library Personnel Office schedules interviews

for them with various campus agencies, at which they are given information on insurance plans, etc. Department Heads or designated peers attempt to assist in familiarizing them with the Library and campus environment. An online Librarian's Handbook containing this information could be referred to readily and could be easily revised and updated.

TRAINING, CROSS TRAINING, RETRAINING, STAFF SHARING

Training can be defined as the "acquisition of those skills which are needed for the proper functioning in the present environment." (Miller, p.34) Though no formal survey was taken on training methods, it is assumed that in the UCSB Library, training in the departments is done on a one-to-one basis by the supervisor, usually with the aid of a training manual. Some cross training (e.g. learning other jobs to serve as a back-up) opportunities exist within individual sections or departments. As departments undertake new functions or begin to automate, retraining is done when necessary, e.g. teaching catalog typists inputting duties. No formal staff sharing (temporary assignments to another job) program exists.

Staff sharing usually occurs to meet some immediate need. As changes occur in libraries due to the implementation of new technologies, the need for a more flexible staff continues to grow. One way for staff to acquire new skills in to take part in campus training programs which offer courses in the use of personal computers, word processing, communication and management skills, etc. Another way is to participate in some cross training or staff sharing within the organization. The advantage of the latter is to gain a broader perspective and knowledge of library operations and the opportunity to learn new skills which might prepare one for higher level positions. Sometimes the only reward would be the opportunity to participate in a new learning experience which would provide variety on the job. A disadvantage of such participation would be any apparent hardships to the department which contributes its members to the program. Comments from Part II of the OCS Questionnaire results have shown that there is a decided employee interest in cross training, retraining and staff sharing activities. This could benefit both the staff and the organization by providing the organization with a pool of well qualified employees who could be called upon to assist in areas where needs occur.

RECOMMENDATION 10. (1-2 years)

Staff exit interviews should be conducted. This would result in a determination of training needs for the position.

RECOMMENDATION 11. (1-2 years)
Draft position descriptions submitted at the time vacancies occur should be accompanied by a document which briefly describes the type of training which will be given.

RECOMMENDATION 12. (1-2 years)

Each department should develop training manuals.

Discussion: These would be kept online so that they could be easily updated. Department heads should require periodic revision of the manuals as necessary with input from appropriate staff of all levels.

RETRAINING, CROSS TRAINING, STAFF SHARING

RECOMMENDATION 13. (2-5 years)

The Library should consider undertaking a limited experiment which could explore the possibility of utilizing retraining, cross training, and staff sharing options.

Discussion: Such an experiment should be conducted for a least one year. During this time it must be closely monitored so that the data collected would supply the necessary information to determine whether the experiment would be practical to implement on a permanent basis.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Career development is defined by Barbara Conroy as "a purposive effort intended to strengthen the library's capacity to fulfill its mission effectively and efficiently by encouraging and providing for the growth of its human resources." (Conroy, Library Staff Development And Continuing Education, p. 292) The OCS Questionnaire did not distinguish professional development as opposed to staff development. In order to simplify our discussion of this topic, "staff development" and "professional development" are considered to be part of a larger entity which we will refer to as "career development."

As stated in Policy 260.1 of the UCSB Staff Personnel Manual, it is the University's policy to "provide employees with career development opportunities in order to improve their service to the University and to assist them in obtaining advancement by merit within the University." In addition to the campus training programs mentioned previously, academic courses are available to career employees with a partial waiver of fees. There is no formal in-house Library career development program in existence. Sometimes formal sessions are sponsored through LAUC-SB or in connection with the Library Personnel Office. Committee work, release time, and a limited amount of funding for professional travel are other componets of career development which are available primarily to academic employees.

RECOMMENDATION 14. (Immediate)

That the Library administration establish support for a career development program both in monetary terms and in philosophical terms.

Discussion: Faced with the prospect of rapid technological change within the next ten years and faced with changing emphases of campus academic programs that the Library will be called upon to support, the need to acquire new skills and competencies and the need to enhance the development of library personnel will be

essential. (Skipper, p.16) Results of the OCS Questionnaire reveal that among Library employees there is a high to moderate degree of interest in career development activities in general (48.18% and 33.58%) With the Library providing time off for attending career development activities and with the Library paying any related expenses, an even higher degree of interest is expressed (57.66%) To be expected, a lesser degree of interest was indicated if the Library would not provide time off (27.74%), or would not pay related expenses (21.90%), or both (13.14%). When questioned whether a well supported and carefully planned program is needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future needs, the majority of respondents indicated that such a program is essential (48.91%), or at least desirable (35.77%).

In order for a career development program to be successful, it must have the support of the Library administration. Given the philosophical framework and the commitment to undertake such an enterprise, objectives need to be articulated as to what the Library hopes to accomplish as a result of such a program. As Hill states:

> If the organization is not better able to meet its objectives as a result of staff development, or if it is difficult to make a reasonable case for a connection between staff development and organizational goals, management should be cautious in expending funds and other resources for it. The connections between development efforts and goal attainment should be empirically or factually demonstrated. (Hill, p. 31)

Among the first steps in making such an endeavor a reality, is the need to issue a written Library policy on career development as an integral facet of overall Library plans and priorities. A written policy would give credence to the administration's stance on the issue and would eliminate the pitfall of providing lip service in support of the idea with little else happening, or of viewing human resource development as only peripherial to Library operations. (Biscoe, p. 68) Optimally, management representatives, supervisors, and employee representatives would collaborate in developing such a policy document.

RECOMMENDATION 15. (0-5 years)

That a needs assessment analysis be conducted in order to determine the interest in, or need for, a formal program.

Discussion: Having established employee interest in, and administrative support of, a development program, one of the initial steps to be undertaken in designing such a program is to ascertain the needs. (Tracey, p. 7; Hill, p. 32) Through a needs analysis, data can be gathered which identifies immediate development needs as well as long term ones. Subsequent to this analysis, decisions about a formalized program can then proceed.

RECOMMENDATION 16. (0-5 years)

If the Library administration favors such a program, a committee should be formed to investigate the issue, with UC Berkeley and the University of Connecticut proposed as models.

Discussion: Both UC Berkeley and the University of Connecticut have human resource development programs in operation. (SPEC Kit 86; SPEC Kit 18; Martell and Dougherty, 1978, p. 154) In addition to examining these proposed models, the committee must realistically consider factors such as budgetary constraints, the limitations within which a program must operate, and the content of, and means of implementing, a viable program which can encompass the expressed needs and interests of Library employees. Over a period of two to three years, an evaluation mechanism should be operational since needs change and organizational objectives may shift in emphasis.

RECOMMENDATION 17. (1-5 years)

That a member of the Library Personnel Office should be responsible for acting as a program coordinator / career counselor.

Discussion: A few courses on career planning are available through the campus training and development offerings. Career counseling occurs within the Library in a rather diffuse fashion. Although no formal avenue of career guidance is currently available within the Library, career development usually occurs as a result of individual efforts in conjunction with the encouragement and support of supervisors and department heads. The literature supports the concept that career development is both an individual responsibility and an organizational responsibility, but the main incentive must come from the individual himself or herself. (Biscoe, p. 69) A career counselor would advise employees about career planning and could also plan and design development programs or activities. (Vaught, p. 14; Biscoe, p. 70)

RECOMMENDATION 18. (Immediately)

That applying for lateral transfers to new departments be encouraged in order to afford new opportunities and / or to exercise underutilized skills.

Discussion: Lateral transfers may open possibilities for career advancement but would not necessary guarantee it. (Coil, p. 60)

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Barbara Conroy defines continuing education as "those learning opportunities utilized by individuals in fulfilling their need to learn and grow following their preparatory education and work experience." (Conroy. Library staff development and continuing education, p. 290.)

The Library has recently developed a policy for support staff on the taking of courses (Library Policy Statement 86-1). (See Appendix II. p. 49-52) Essentially it allows the employee compensatory time off and payment of fees for courses taken at the request of the Department Head and for approved position and

career related programs. The Library does not normally pay fees or allow time off for educational enrichment programs (those related to the employee's personal interest or career outside the University). The employee may arrange for an alternate work schedule within the established 7:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m. working day to make up the time spent in pursuing educational enrichment courses. If that is not feasible, the employee may request the use of vacation time.

Though the policy provides valid guidelines, the subcommittee wishes to suggest some additional alternatives which would be considered only if very specific conditions are met.

RECOMMENDATION 19. (0-5 years)

The library should offer a voluntary option to all career employees which would grant release time of not more than four hours per week to pursue continuing education, research or project work relating to educational enrichment.

Discussion: This would be considered only if the following conditions were met:

1) The employee has worked in the library for a minimum of one year, and in the case of support staff, has successfully passed the probationary period. Highest priority should be given to employees at the top of their range.
2) The employee's performance must be more than marginally satisfactory and preferably show evidence of more than satisfactory performance and potential.
3) The release time would not cause undue hardship in the employee's department.
4) The employee must present a written justification for purusing the study, outlining specific goals to be accomplished, with an estimated time frame for completion. The employee must remain consistent in focusing efforts toward a realistic, attainable goal.
5) Requests must be approved through the line as well as examined by a library standing committee, consisting of representatives of both series of employees, who would recommend on the request. The committee would also play a part in monitoring the employee's progress, especially if the goal is long range. The employee should also file a progress report. Time frames for this would vary according the individual cases. If evidence indicates that the employee is not spending time properly in achieving the goal, support would be withdrawn. This would also be noted in the employee's personnel file.

More specific procedural details should be established by a library ad-hoc committee and coordinated through the Library Personnel Office.

This option would provide a means of incentives other than money or promotion for rewarding good employees. Though benefits to the organization are not as direct, there are indirect benefits such as "The inner satisfaction employees hold towards the library ... Once employees have sensed an explicit managerial concern for their personal growth and well-being, they may begin to seek a more direct correlation between course work and library work. Without this possibility, employees will find their life satisfactions in areas external to their library role." (Martell and Dougherty, p. 154.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aveney, Brian, "Electronic Publishing And The Information Transfer Process", Special Libraries, 74, Oct. 1983, p. 338-344.

Biscoe, Eleanor Lynch and Elizabeth W. Stone, "Motivation And Staff Development", Journal of Library Administration, 1,(1), Spring 1980, p. 55-72.

Coil, Ann, "Job Matching Brings Out The Best In Employees", Personnel Journal, Jan. 1984, p. 54-60.

Collins, John F., "How to Motivate Your Employees", Nation's Business, Dec. 1982, p. 48-50.

Conroy, Barbara, "A Consumer's Guide To Staff Development Resources", Journal of Library Administration 1, (1), Spring 1980, p. 41-53.

Conroy, Barbara. Library Staff Development And Continuing Education. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1978.

Creth, Sheila, "Staff Sharing -- A Concept That Works: A Case Study", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 10, (5), Nov. 1984, p. 287-289.

Dougherty, Richard M. and Wendy P. Lougee, "Research Library Residencies: A New Model For Professional Development", Library Journal, 108, July 1983, p. 1322-1324.

Higham, Norman. The Librarian In The University. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.

Hill, James W., "A Model For Staff Development", Journal of Library Administration, 1, (1), Spring 1980, p. 31-40.

Jackson, William J., "Staff Selection And Training For Quality Online Searching", RQ, 22, Fall 1982, p. 48-54.

Lancaster, F.W., Laura S. Drasgow and Ellen B. Marks, "The Changing Face Of The Library; A Look At Libraries And Librarians In The Year 2001", Collection Management, 3, (1), Spring 1979, p. 55-77.

McLean, Neil, "New Technology In Academic Libraries", in: Studies in Library Management, 7, 1982, p. 144-166.

Martell, Charles, "Improving The Effectiveness Of Libraries Through Improvements In The Quality Of Working Life", College and Research Libraries, 42, Sept. 1981, p. 435-466.

Martell, Charles, "QWL Strategies, People Are The Castle, People Are The Walls, People Are The Moat", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 10, (6), January 1985, p. 350-354.

Martell, Charles R. and Richard M. Dougherty, "The Role Of Continuing Education And Training In Human Resource

Development: An Administrator's Viewpoint", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, (3), July 1978, p. 151, 155.

Main, Alex. Educational Staff Development. London: Croom Helm, 1985.

Miller, James E., "Eliminate Your Obsolescence", Journal of Systems Management, 27, Nov. 1976, p. 34.

Page-Jones, Meilir, "Staff Development Requires Education, Promotion and Motivation", Data Management, Oct. 1985, p. 32-66.

Professional Development in ARL Libraries, Kit 86 (August, 1982). Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1982. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

Recruitment Practices in ARL Libraries, Kit 78 (October, 1981). Washington, D.C: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1981. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

Roberts, Anne F., "The Academic Librarian As Leader Or Manager", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 11, (1), Mar. 1985, p. 14-18.

Rosenberg, Jane E. and Maureen Sullivan. Resource Notebook On Staff Development. Washington, D.C.: Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries, 1983.

Rutledge, Daniel B., "Job Permanency: The Academic Librarian's Dilemma Is The Administrator's Challenge For The 1980's", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 7, (1), March 1981, p. 29-41.

Skipper, James E., "The Academic Library And The Future", Source: Unknown, p. 15-22.

Snyder, Carolyn A. and Nancy P. Sanders, "Continuing Education And Staff Development: Needs Assessment, Comprehensive Program Planning, And Evaluation", Journal of Academic Librarianship, 4, (3), July 1978, p. 144-150.

Staff Development Kit 18 (May, 1975). Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1975. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

Staff Development Kit 75 (June, 1981). Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1981. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

Stone, Elizabeth W., ed., "Personnel Development And Continuing Education In Libraries", Library Trends, 20, (1), July 1971, p. 3-183.

Stueart, Robert, ed. Academic Librarianship: Yesterday, Today, And Tomorrow. New York: Schuman Publishers, 1982.

Tenopir, Carol, "In-House Training And Staff Development", Library Journal, 109, May 1984, p. 870-871.

Tracey, William R. Designing Training And Development Systems. New York: American Management Association, 1971.

"UCSB Begins New Planning Process", Campus: a weekly newsletter for UCSB faculty and staff, Jan. 13, 1986, p. 1-2.

"UCSB Plans Process For Long-Range Enrollment", University Bulletin: a publication for the faculty and staff of the University of California, 34, (14), Nov. 25-29, 1985, p. 48.

Vaught, Bobby C., Frank Hoy and W. Wray Buchanan. Employee Development Programs: An Organizational Approach. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 1985.

Veaner, Allen, "1985 To 1995: The Next Decade In Academic Librarianship, Part I", College and Research Libraries, 46, (3), May 1985, p. 209-229.

Veaner, Allen, "1985 To 1995: The Next Decade In Academic Librarianship, Part II", College and Research Libraries, 46, (4), July 1985, p. 295-319.

APPENDIX I

August 16, 1985

TO: Department Heads

FROM: Joseph A. Boisse

SUBJECT: Support Staff Orientation

Attached is Library Policy Statement 85-5 concerning orientation for all library support personnel.

It's overall implementation is the responsibility of the AUL for Personnel. We will move ahead with implementation this Fall.

Please make certain that the document receives wide circulation in your departments.

Thank you.

JAB:ir
cc: Administrative Group
Lucia Snowhill

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for interdepartmental use)

LIBRARY POLICY STATEMENT 85-5

Orientation Program For New Library Support Personnel

The orientation of the new staff member to the job, the Library and the Campus is carried out by a number of employees and in a number of meetings: This document summarizes the various steps in the orientation process. It is designed to help employees feel they are a part of the Library as quickly as possible.

There are six parts to the orientation process:

A. Initial Sign Up and Individual Benefits Counseling (Library Personnel Office)
B. Departmental Orientation
C. Quarterly Orientation Coffee Hour with Library Administration
D. General Library Orientation Program
E. Library Skills Orientation
F. Campus Personnel Orientation Meeting

The timing, responsibility, subjects covered and other information on each part of the program are outlined below:

A. INITIAL SIGN UP AND INDIVIDUAL BENEFITS COUNSELING (LPO)

When: At time of appointment to position
Where: Library Personnel Office, Room 3593-N
Who is responsible: Administrative Assistant in the Library Personnel Office
Forms prepared: (a) Personnel Action Form (PAF), (b) Personal Data Form (PDF), (c) Oath of Allegiance/Patent Agreement, (d) W-4 Income Tax Form, (e) Ethnic Identification Form, (f) Parking Application, (g) Emergency Information Form, (h) On-The-Job Injury Physician Designation Form, and (i) Sure-Pay Form.
Material given to new employee: (a) Salary Scale, (b) Library Organization Chart, (c) Job Description, (d) Time Card, (e) Staff Indentification Card, (f) "Summary of Benefits" Booklet, and (g) Information on orientation of new staff members.
Discuss the following with employee:
(a) Explain what is in the Staff Personnel Handbook, the Union Contract and accompanying material.
(b) Explain the time sheet and how to fill it out.
(c) Explain the Orientation Program.
(d) Urge the employee to read about the health, dental and life insurance plans and point out the effective date for any plan is the day the enrollment form is received in the Accounting Department. Inform employee of the next Benefits Orientation Meeting given by Campus Personnel (usually held weekly on Fridays at 11:00 a.m.).
(e) Explain mechanics of probationary period and evaluation cycles.

(f) Explain employee benefits, e.g., holidays; vacation and sick leave; health, dental, and life insurance plans; employee development, reduced fee enrollment; privileges - library card, recreational discounts, use of UCSB facilities.
(g) General information - location of bookstore, check-cashing, eating facilities, post office, etc.; Credit Union, bus service.
(h) General conditions of employment - hours of work, rest periods/ lunch, organizational structure (line structure).
(i) Information regarding Safety Committee and Safety Regulations.

Introduction to Assistant/Associate University Librarian (AUL):

(a) If AUL is available take the new employee in for a talk.
(b) If the AUL is not available leave a note so the AUL can call in the employee later.

Administrative Assistant takes employee to Department Head

B. DEPARTMENTAL ORIENTATION

When: First day of work
Who is responsible: Department Head (and/or Supervisor)
Items Covered:

(a) Introduction to staff members in the department.
(b) Review of job description.
(c) Discussion of organization and functions of the department.
(d) Discussion of safety-location and availability of safety manual.
(e) Review of departmental time sheet procedures and vacation and sick leave policies.
(f) Training plan.
(g) Start of on-the-job instruction.
(h) A volunteer peer will be assigned to each new staff employee by the Department Head to assist in getting acquainted with the Department, the Library and the campus. The peer will carry out the following functions to the extent desired by the new employee.

(1) Accompany the new employee for coffee and to lunch for at least one day.
(2) Encourage the new employee to read the Staff Personnel Policies or Union Contract as appropriate.
(3) Acquaint the new employee with the following areas of the Library:

Staff Room	Change Machines
Circulation	Information Desk (Lost/Found)
Cot Rooms	Bulletin Boards
Cassette tour of Library (Available in Reference)	Telephones
Emergency Exits	Xerox Machines

(4) Acquaint the new employee with the following areas of Campus:

The Arbor	Post Office
De La Guerra Commons	Arts and Lectures Office
University Center	Recreational Facilities
Student Health	Parking Areas

The peer should attempt to complete this part of the orientation within one week.

C. QUARTERLY ORIENTATION COFFEE HOUR WITH LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

When: First Wednesday of appropriate month at 10:00 a.m.
Who is responsible: Hosted by University Librarian; arranged by the LPO
Where: Librarian's Conference Room, Third Floor of Library
Who: All employees who have been appointed to a position since the previous meeting.
Procedure: The week prior to the meeting the Library Personnel Office will send an invitation to each participant via the Department Head.

(a) General presentation by University Librarian
(b) Questions and answer period.

D. GENERAL LIBRARY ORIENTATION PROGRAM

When: Three times per year (During quarter breaks)
Who: Support staff personnel who were appointed to a position at least three months prior to the scheduled meeting.
Description of Program: The participants visit each department in the library. The purpose of these orientation sessions is to provide a general picture of the organization and functions of each Library Department and its relationship with other Library Departments. Where appropriate, collections maintained by the Department are described. The orientation sessions do not include procedural details. The sessions are spread over four days with three areas visited each day.
Procedures: The week prior to the orientation program, a list of participants is prepared by the Library Personnel Office and sent to each Department Head along with a copy of the program for each participant. The day prior to the opening session each department will be contacted by telephone to be reminded of the meeting. It is expected that the Department Head, in most cases, will make the presentation.

E. LIBRARY SKILLS ORIENTATION

When: At conclusion of successful probationary period.
Who: Support staff personnel.
Procedure: The individual staff member, after consultation with his/her department head, consults the reference librarian designated liaison by the head of reference and arranges to complete the basic skills workbook. The project may be done over a period of weeks but should be completed within two months.

F. CAMPUS PERSONNEL ORIENTATION MEETING: In addition to the Library's orientation of new employees, the Campus Personnel Department has an orientation meeting for all new Campus employees once every six weeks. Employees are notified by mail by the Employee Development and Training Division of Campus Personnel.

August 16, 1985

APPENDIX II

LIBRARY POLICY STATEMENT 86-1

The Taking of Courses

Scope

This document covers requests by any library support staff member to attend courses held on campus other than extension courses. It does not cover courses which are held at the request of the Library. Guidelines for attendance at those courses will be provided at the time the course is announced. For the purpose of this document, "course" is used whether an offering requires a single attendance or attendance on several occasions.

Policy

It is the policy of the Library to encourage attendance at courses for the purpose of employee development within the capacity of the Library to release employees from their regular duties. This document provides procedures and guidelines for the submission and review of requests to attend courses.

I. PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS.

a. The employee submits a completed "Request to take a course which is not part of the academic program" form (Lib – 637), or a "Request to take a University course" form (Lib – 484), whichever is appropriate. The form should be accompanied by any course announcement or registration form.

b. The Department Head reviews requests and approves those which are judged to be appropriate. The guidelines to be followed in the review procedure are:

1. The primary consideration in reviewing requests will be the needs of the Department. The Department Head will judge how much time can be spared from departmental activities for course attendance. Inevitably, because of the type of work involved, some departments will be able to release staff members more easily than other departments.

2. A secondary consideration will be the type of course being requested. There are three types of courses: those which are directly related to the position currently held by a staff member (Position-oriented programs); those which are related to career development but not to the current position (Career-related programs); and those related to a staff member's personal enrichment or career outside the University (Educational enrichment programs).

The first priority will be given to courses which the Department Head wishes staff members to take. These will be Position-related programs which the Department Head judges to be desirable for enhancing work performance in the current position. Second priority will be given to

Position-related programs requested by staff members. The Department Head will decide whether or not a particular course is job related. Third priority will be given to Career-related programs, and the lowest priority will be given to Educational enrichment programs.

3. In making distinctions between a number of requests having the same priority, the Department Head will take into account such factors as the number of courses already taken by an individual, particularly those related to the current request, and how well a staff member has utilized material from previous courses. The individual's history in pursuing career development may also be considered.

c. The Department Head sends approved requests to the appropriate Associate/Assistant University Librarian for approval.

d. The Department Head returns requests which are not approved to the staff member. If, after discussion with the Department Head, the staff member wishes the request to be forwarded for review by the AUL, the Department Head will attach the reasons why the request was not granted, and send the request on for review.

e. The appropriate AUL reviews requests and forwards those which are approved to the Library Personnel Office for final processing. Requests which are not approved by the AUL are returned to the staff member through the line structure.

II. Provision for time off and payment for courses.

a. For courses taken at the request of the Department Head, the Library will provide payment of fees and time off with pay. If the course is held at a time when the employee is not normally scheduled to work, the Department Head will arrange for a variation in schedule in the same week.

b. The Library will also provide time off and payment of fees for approved Position-related programs and Career-related programs. However, compensatory time will not be arranged for attendance at course which are held at times when the employee is not normally scheduled to work.

c. The Library will not normally pay fees or allow time off with pay for Educational enrichment programs. Where possible, the Department Head may arrange for an alternate work schedule to be arranged within the established 7:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m. working day, in order for a staff member to attend an educational enrichment course. Where this is not feasible the staff member may request the use of vacation time. The Department Head will balance this request with Departmental needs following established procedures for vacation time requests.

d. It is the clear responsibility of employees to attend courses which have been approved. They must notify their Department Head or the Library Personnel Office in advance of the meeting date if there is good reason why attendance at an approved course is not possible.

III. This document is in accordance with Staff Personnel Policy 260 and the AFSCME contract.

February, 1986

(Use Form Lib-484 for UCSB Academic Program Courses)

Part I should be prepared by the staff member, attached to any course announcement or registration form, and routed to immediate supervisor. See Library Policy 86-1.

PART I

NAME: DEPARTMENT: DATE:

Name of course	Agency offering course	Meeting Times: Dates and hours	Cost

Reason for desiring to take course, explanation of job relatedness (if appropriate), and brief description of career aims.

Request:

- ☐ Time off with pay
- ☐ Alternate work schedule
- ☐ Leave without pay
- ☐ Fees paid by Library
- ☐ Fees paid by staff member

Signature of Staff Member

PART II

Comments and recommendations of immediate supervisor

Indicate job relatedness, recommendation as to fees and time off, and the effect of the absence or change in work schedule on operations.

- ☐ Time off with pay
- ☐ Alternate work schedule
- ☐ Leave without pay
- ☐ Fees paid by Library
- ☐ Fees paid by staff mem!

(Lib-637)

-51-

Signature of Supervisor

Comments and Recommendations of the Department Head

Recommend:

- ☐ Time off with pay
- ☐ Alternate work schedule
- ☐ Leave without pay
- ☐ Fees paid by Library
- ☐ Fees paid by staff member

Signature of Department Head

PART IV

Action by the Associate/Assistant University Librarian

- ☐ Time off with pay
- ☐ Alternate work schedule
- ☐ Leave without pay
- ☐ Fees paid by Library
- ☐ Fees paid by staff member

Signature of AUL

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION AND STAFFING

GOAL III
Subcommittee on Organizational Climate

INTRODUCTION

Description: There are many components of organizational climate, including morale, job satisfaction, motivation, communication, trust and respect between all members of the organization, accountability, defined and articulated goals and objectives, personal fulfillment, the call for excellence, and minimal friction or tension between different levels of employees. Together, these components make up the overall tone, or climate, of an organization.

Organizational climate is important. A low or negative climate can have drastic effects on productivity, work quality, employee absenteeism and job turnover. It can also inhibit employee willingness to accept change. By recognizing problems and making sincere efforts to counteract negatives, an organization can improve work and service quality, organizational image, and adaptability to change. Ideally, organizational climate should be constantly monitored so that problems can be dealt with immediately.

This subcommittee was established to investigate the current organizational climate of the UCSB Library, and to recommend any changes seen as necessary to obtain an optimal organizational climate in the future.

Assumption: Our assumption for this study was that the current organizational climate within the library is predominantly negative due to the lack, or negative tone, of one or more of the components mentioned previously. To test this assumption we searched current literature, performed informal interviews with some library employees, and did a questionnaire on organizational climate, communication, and staffing management and planning.

The results of the OCS Questionnaire supported our assumption in many ways, but not exclusively. There were several gradations of morale within the library, ranging from positive for individuals to negative for library management. A more complete discussion of the questionnaire results can be found in the next section of this report.

Literature: A complete bibliography of the literature used to research this topic is attached. Not all of the titles in the bibliography are directly referenced in the report, but they were valuable sources of information on the areas discussed.

Recommendations: The final section of this report is made up of recommendations for change and/or improvements that we see as necessary based on the questionnaire results and the literature. There are time references for all recommendations. These were decided by assessing how long it would take to begin implementing the recommendation in question. The emphasis of the entire Public Service Study is 5-10 years in the future, but we feel that most of the recommendations in this subcommittee report can, and should, be implemented by the 5-year limit, since without a positive organizational climate there is the risk of failure in implementing many of the other recommendations that come out of this study.

OCS QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

We received 137 responses to our questionnaire, which is 69% of career employees in the library. Other break-downs include 36 Academic employees (71%), 98 classified staff (66%), and 11 management level employees (73%). For the purpose of our report, we focused our attention on the Library-wide results.

There were some very strong, consistent patterns in the responses to the questionnaire. Most employees responded in a positive manner to questions regarding their immediate work environment, with the results shifting to more negative responses to areas such as library management. Such response patterns are significant when it is realized that management is responsible for the overall tone of an organization. To investigate this further, let's take a look at the areas examined in the questionnaire.

One of the prime areas of interest was the different levels of management within the library. These levels are Supervisor, Department Head, and Library Administration. In many cases, the Supervisor and Deparment Head or Administration levels are the same, which explains most of the fluctuation in percentages between questions for the different levels. What we wanted to know is whether or not there are significant problems between employees and the various levels of management. The results are very clear.

Supervisors were judged in a predominantly positive manner in all areas. Library employees evaluated their supervisors quite high in willingness to engage in two-way communication- such as asking for suggestions and ideas (Question A 5), and most employees (69.35%) stated on Question 23, Section A that they had high respect for their supervisor. These two factors are important components of organizational climate, and such positive responses are evidence that this level of management is supportive of positive organizational climate.

Department Heads although generally receiving favorable responses, did get judged more harshly in some areas of orgnaizational climate. There were indications that Department Heads don't solicite much input from their staff in decision-making processes (Question A 4:56.21%), that they don't take as much responsibility for decisions as they should (34.31%), and that they aren't as open to innovative concepts as supervisors are (Question B 7:24.82%). The negative percentages for these were not overwhelming, but were high enough to indicate a problem.

Department Heads did receive a high percentage (65.70%) of positive responses in the areas of respect. This figure corresponds closely to that of respect for Supervisors, so it appears that although Department Heads may be a bit less supportive of positive organizational climate, there is still a feeling by employees that Department Heads care equally for their employees and the organization as a whole.

Most of the negative responses for Department Heads were in the area of communication (Question A 4 and B 7). Instead of two-way communication being emphasized, it appeared that Department Heads practice a more one-way communication style. As stated earlier, they don't solicit feedback from their employees as much as suprvisors do, and many employees responded that their Department Head is often away from their desk or too busy to approach (Question B 7:15.33% and 21.90%). This interferes with effective communication and could be an indication that Department Heads are becoming removed or alienated from the work done in their department due to other duties. This factor should be investigated further.

Both Supervisor and Department Head levels of library management received predominantly positive judgment by employees, with Department Heads receiving some negative responses in the area of communication. The next level of management, Library Administration, received much less positive judgments by library staff members, and not only in communication.

Unlike Supervisors and Department Heads, Library Administration does not seem to be respected by much of the staff. Where Department Heads and Supervisors received 65.70% and 69.35% of positive responses respectively, Library Administration received only 31.39% positive response to the same question. This is a decrease of approximately 35%. This is despite the fact that more people answered the question regarding respect for Library Administration than either of the other two questions. The negative vote in this area could be a reflection of the negative response by employees (56.94%) who say that the Library Administration treats employees more like objects than people. It would seem that the overall image of the Library Administration is a predominantly negative one. Since Administration is responsible for the overall tone of the organization, perhaps it is not surprising that employees judged the overall morale within the library to be low to very low by 67.16%.

Another indication of negative attitude about Library Administration is that a high percentage of employees rated Administration as "too busy to be disturbed," "appearing

uninterested in new ideas," and "not encouraging communication" (Question B 8:24.09%; 24.82%; and 43.07%). What is needed, it seems, is a drastic evaluation by Library Administrators of their image to their employees. It is likely that there is a large discrepency between what Administration thinks is being projected, and what employees are interpreting. Evidence of this can be seen in two other questions (Question C 18 and A 21). Administration was not seen as supporting "team work" (36.43% negative), and only 46.72% of employees saw the Library Administration as supporting excellence of service (as opposed to 93.43% and 65.70% positive responses for individuals and Department Heads, respectively- Questions A 19 and 20).

What is needed, as supported by the above percentages and other negative responses to be dealt with next, seems to be a change in management style within the UCSB Library,

Management style originates with Administration, and should then be consistent throughout the other levels of management within the organization. Some specific areas of library management were included on the questionnaire. Results are listed below.

Staff does not feel that incompetence or "cheaters" (Questions A 8 and 9) are dealt with effectively (66.43% and 58.40% respectively). This implies that there is no consistent or reliable method for dealing with problem employees, which does not encourage positive organizational climate. Employees often stop caring about their own performance if they don't see others punished for abusing the system. This attitude was reflected by 47.45% judging the effectiveness of overall library management in a negative fashion (Question A 13). For Question A 17, 40.15% believe that evaluation policies and procedures are not fair and honest, and 37.23% do not feel that formal complaint channels are effective (Question B 14). All of these factors can have significant effects on not only morale, but also motivation, communication, and the call for excellence.

The questionnaire also showed that staff members do not feel that career development is supported by the Library (59.13%), while 84.68% believe that career development support is either essential or desirable (Question C 21a). This shows that employees see discrepencies between what is wanted or needed, and what is given. There were also strong positive responses to raising performance expectations (54.74%) and active retraining (84.67%).

Overall, it can be stated that while employees are not totally dissatisfied with the organizational climate within the library, they are not happy with either the management style or management attitude toward employees. Through the questionnaire, library employees have been able to make strong statements on where problem areas are, as well as showing appreciation for other areas. It can be assumed that if the Library Administration really cares about changing their image, attitude and style, as well as the overall organizational climate, the questionnaire results can help focus attention on specific areas that need changing. By listening to employees' comments and suggestions, Administrators can insure that the changes will be supported by library employees of all levels.

THE CALL FOR EXCELLENCE

The call for excellence is seen as the support and encouragement of a higher level of performance of service within the organization rather than the acceptance of the status quo. Top level management (the Library Administration) is responsible for setting the tone of the organization by initiating, promoting and enforcing the pursuit of excellence at all levels, through stated goals and objectives.

Middle management (Department Heads and Supervisors) have the responsibility of making sure that the goals and objectives are reached. In order to accomplish this, middle managment must have the necessary information, sufficient staffing, training and feedback. (Bradford; Peters: Quick)

As stated in the literature and accepted by this subcommittee, there are certain vital components that comprise the call for excellence. These components are strong, supportive leadership; active concern for employee motivation; accountability at all levels of the organization; cohesive team-building and staff involvement; mutual trust and respect between employees and management; and an atmposphere of healthy competition that encourages creative and innovative thinking, risk taking and does not condemn failure. (Quick; Bradford, Rosenbaum; Raudsepp)

If changes, major or minor, are planned, these components of the call for excellence need to be part of management's program, so implementation will meet little or no resistance from staff.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-5 Years)
That the Library Administration establish realistic goals and objectives that are relevant to the library, accepted by employees, and that demand the call for excellence.

Discussion:
The help of a qualified consultant should be obtained, and input from staff members is essential.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-5 Years)
That all employees in management and supervisory positions be required to take classes and/or attend seminars on management techniques, problem-solving and employee motivation so that the call for excellence can be effectively carried out within the library.

Discussion:
The classes should be designed specifically for library needs and be held often enough to insure that new supervisors can take advantage of them. Those attending the classes should be held accountable for implementing supervisory skills and techniques learned in these classes.

RECOMMENDATION III: (3-5 Years)
That an in-depth evaluation of the goals and objectives regarding the call for excellence be done to see how effective they have been, and to make any needed changes that should be made.

RECOMMENDATION IV: (3-5 Years)
That an evaluation of the classes should be done to judge how well they have prepared management to support and encourage excellence within the library.

Discussion:
The staff should also be included in giving feedback on the effectiveness of the classes and training.

ALTERNATE WORK SCHEDULES

In the past 10-15 years, there has been significant change in the attitudes toward schedules. Many businesses and companies have started allowing employees various scheduling options, including flexible schedules and compressed work weeks. These variations have come about because of many social and economic factors, such as the increase in double-income or single parent families. Also, more and more of today's workers are demanding the right to have more say in how their work and personal schedules are divided. (Rosow; Ronen; Nollen)

Where variant schedules have been introduced, it has been proven that more positive than negative results have been achieved. Reduced absenteeism, turnover, and tardiness; increased productivity and quality of work; improved employee morale; and better management are only a few of the positive results of alternative work schedules. (Rosow; Dunham)

There are some disadvantages to alternate scheduling. These include the fact that not all positions within an organization can necessarily work with alternate scheduling, some Supervisors resist change because they feel that they will lose control, and in the case of compressed work weeks, some problems have been experienced in clearing rules with unions. All of these problems can be alleviated with advanced planning, discussions, and training. Supervisors are the key to a successful alternate work schedule program. If they are not consulted when planning the changes, they can feel manipulated and therefore resist or refuse to cooperate. (Rosow and Zager)

For our purposes, we are not suggesting true flextime or the 4/40 work week. What we would like to see are added scheduling options, including 7:00-4:00, 7:30-4:30, 8:00-5:00, 8:30-5:30, 9:00-6:00 Monday through Friday, and a 4 1/2 day week (4 9-hour days and a 1/2 day). Employees would pick the schedule best suited to their needs, and be allowed to maintain that schedule as long as it does not interfere with library service and work.

In our questionnaire we asked employees if they thought having a more flexible schedule would cause any inconvenience to others. There was a strong response by 75.18% that such an option would seldom (if at all) inconvenience other employees or library users. Such a strong response deserves an honest look at the possibility of flexible or alternate work schedules within the library.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-1 Year)
That the possibility of implementing alternate work schedules within the library to seriously be considered.

Discussion:
Consultation with qualified experts, site visits to libraries and companies currently using alternate scheduling, and an in-depth evaluation of current literature should be a vital part of such an investigation.

RECOMMENDATION II: (1-1.5 Years)
That an experiment limited to 1-2 library departments be established for a period of 6 months to test the practicality of alternate work schedules.

Discussion:
Continual evaluation and systematic data collection should be done to judge its effect on communication, service and work quality and quantity, and employee motivation and job satisfaction. At the completion of the experiment, an all-staff library meeting should take place to discuss the results of the experiment. Questions could be answered for those not involved with the test. If the experiment is judged unsuccessful due to unresolvable difficulties, all library staff should be informed openly and honestly as to why the program is being abandoned. If judged successful, plans should be discussed for implementing the program throughout the library.

RECOMMENDATION III: (1.5-2 Years)
That alternate work schedules be implemented throughout the library, based on the results of the experiment.

Discussion:
Scheduling rules and expectations should be clearly articulated to all staff members. Schedules should be allotted by interest, with conflicts being resolved by proven need. As long as all desks and phones are covered adequately, departments should be allowed to set up the schedules that work best for their needs. Rules should be established regarding abuse of the program such as removing the privelege of alternate schedules for a certain time period. Alternate scheduling should be set, not variable on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis, and employees should communicate their schedules to those who need the information.

RECOMMENDATION IV: (2-5 Years)
That an on-going evaluation of the program be maintained to judge its effectiveness.

Discussion:
Any needed changes or adjustments can be made during this time frame. At the end of the fifth year, employees should be surveyed to see how they perceive the program in relation to their work quality and quantity, job satisfaction, morale, and personal time. If no problems are in evidence, the program should be established as a regular policy within the library until proven ineffective or unnecessary.

STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION-MAKING

It is generally accepted that participatory management should be encouraged from top to bottom in almost all organizations. (Dewar) Participatory management can be defined as management which involves all levels of staff in all levels of decision-making.

As Charles Martell states in his articles on the Quality of Work Life (QWL) one way a member of an organization can satisfy important personal needs is through participation in decision making. Motivation is increased when employees are attracted by but not pushed toward goals. Improved employee attitudes through decision-making involvement can lead to greater willingness to work as a team toward goals set by the organization. (Dewar)

It has to be remembered that the library is not a democracy, but it also has to be kept in mind that employees are a great reservoir of knowledge and ideas that can be tapped for the good of the organization, as well as for the good of the employee himself.

Involvement is especially important when change is anticipated. For successful change, employee involvement from the very beginning and throughout the change process is important. When people are involved in the change process they have a greater committment to the outcome. People are resistant to changes that are foisted upon them without participation and involvement in their development. (Allan, Kraft)

There is not just one type or form of participatory management. It can be introduced in different areas and in different staff-involving techniques, i.e., Quality Circles, meetings and committees.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-5 Years)
Adopt a management style more visible and less seclusive.

Discussion:
Current literature and written comments in Sections A and B of Part II of the OCS Questionnaire request and recommend a style of management which can be simply called "Management By Walking Around (MBWA)".

This idea was formulated by Tom Peters in IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE, and is enlarged upon in the current popular book A PASSION FOR EXCELLENCE, which he co-authored with Nancy Austin.

It basically can be defined as getting out of one's office for at least part of the day, and getting to know first-hand what is going on and who your employees and customers are. It is a hands-on approach to participatory management.

From responses as blatant as not even knowing who the administration is, to many requests for the UL and AUL's to be more visible, to visit departments, attend meetings, talk to staff, and have occasional "brown bag" lunches with staff there seems to be a call for change in management style, in the library and to many staff this is a very important issue.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-5 Years)
Implement open and set office hours for all the Library Administration and Department Heads, which welcome and encourage staff to approach with questions, ideas, suggestions and complaints.

Discussion:
Although the response in the OCS Questionnaire to Question 9 of Section B was not definitive concerning wanting open office hours, with 18.25% answering "yes" and 20.44% answering in the negative, however, 43.07% did respond "maybe". With the adoption of a "MBWA-type" of management style, (see Recommendation I), staff would get to know the administration better and might feel more comfortable approaching them during open office hours.

If regular, set office hours can't be scheduled and maintained, then each week's allotted hours should be published in the in-house newsletter (Schedule & Report). If regularly scheduled hours are decided upon changes and variations (vacations, conferences, etc.) should be announced in advance, when possible, in the regular newsletter. Confidentiality should be expected and respected, but when it must be breeched for the good of the organization, the individual involved needs to be informed and to approve this action.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-5 Years)
Regular, interactive and informative meetings should be mandated at the Library and Departmental level.

Discussion:
Meeting agendas should be published and circulated prior to the meeting to allow staff time for informative response and input. Meetings are a way of sharing important information and allow employees at all levels the opportunity to pool ideas and hear information first-hand and accurately.

Minutes of departmental meetings should be taken and submitted to AUL to in sure that meetings are being held on a regular basis and that information is being passed on to staff as necessary and in a timely fashion, and not being spread via the grapevine.

Key Administrators should meet on an annual basis with individual departments for closer contact with staff and a chance for questions and the inter-change of ideas.

RECOMMENDATION IV: (0-5 Years)
Involve staff at all levels on committees.

Discussion:
Committees can be used by management for four reasons:

1. Exchanging of views and information.
2. Generating ideas and listing alternatives.
3. Recommending a single course of action.
4. Problem solving. (Webber)

Committees in the library are another way of encouraging staff involvement and ownership. They are also a way to involve staff at all levels in working together.

Committees are a way of re-inforcing teamwork on a library-wide basis, a need shown on the questionnaire. As shown in Questions 17 and 18 of Part C of the OCS Questionnaire, on the departmental level there is a feeling of working as a team with 54.75% of the staff answering in the affirmative. At the library-wide level, however, only 9.49% answered in the affirmative, while 66.43% answered negatively to this question.

RECOMMENDATION V: (0-3 Years)
That Quality Circles should be tested as limited experiments in one or two areas of the Library. This should be done after the Library has done adequate planning, research and possibly site visits or consultation with organizations which already use the Quality Circle technique.

Discussion:
Quality Circles are defined as a small group/circle of employees from the same work area who meet regularly and voluntarily to identify, solve and implement solutions to work-related problems. Members of the Quality Circle (QC) are usually trained in two kinds of techniques; problem-solving methods and group processes. The QC leader is often a

supervisor who is first trained by someone experienced in the QC process. The leader in turn trains the circle members. The circle works on one problem at a time and proposed solutions are presented to management for approval. (Dewar, Mourey & Mansfield)

Quality Circles offer the greatest potential contribution in situations characterized by underutilization of resources and suboptimal performance, states Robert Wood in a working paper on Quality Cirlces. (Mourey)

The benefits from Quality Circles:

1. Help to develop a team atmosphere.
2. Provide for easy exchange of ideas in smaller group settings.
3. Helps inter-group cooperation (between ranks).
4. Reduces problems because staff forsees them.
5. Provides better understanding of job requirements.
6. Helps to develop leadership.
7. Goal-setting and feedback improve.

Quality Circles work when certain steps and factors are taken into consideration, both where they exist and when they are tested:

1. Management is supportive.
2. Participation is voluntary.
3. There is a people-building attitude.
4. Training is provided.
5. Teamwork is encouraged.
6. Recognition is provided.
7. Members select problems in their area of expertise.
8. Circles solve problems, not just identify them.

(Dewar)

It is recommended that all these factors be in effect to make this experiment valid. The Quality Circle technique should have a built-in mechanism of insuring that approved ideas are implemented. Implemented recommendations and procedures should be reviewed in the normal fashion that all procedures are reviewed, to insure that they work and are appropriate to the work that is being done.

The literature has shown that after six years of having Quality Circles they were especially successful when used with some modifications or alternatives to the strict QC approach. That is adjusting the Quality Circle concept to fit the company/business in which it is being used. Some of the revisions companies made were to get results more quickly by shortening the cycle of problem solving, getting management's approval and moving on to the next problem. (Pascarella)

RECOMMENDATION VI: (0-3 Years)
Evaluation of the Quality Circle experiment should be done early and then on a regular basis to see if QC's are beneficial and to make sure that all factors to insure their success are being taken into consideration. If Quality Circles are seen as beneficial they should be started in other areas of the library, especially with change being forseen. Adequate training should be given for all QC participants.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE RANKS

Cooperation between different levels of employees is based on the basic elements of team work: balanced work loads; equal say in decision-making; clearly defined duties; open communication; mutual trust and respect; appreciation of work done by all; and working toward a common goal. A lack of any one of the components can inhibit team work; the lack of 2 or more can create an environment of hostility and mistrust.

There were some strong statements on team work in staff responses on the OCS Questionnaire (Questions 17 and 18 of Section C). Library-wide, employees responded positively about team work in their department-54.75%, while only 9.49% agreed to a feeling of team work within the library as a whole. The fact that only a little over half of library employees felt that team work existed even in their department indicated that this is a problem. Based on the results to questions about workloads, communication, the call for excellence and respect for management (Question 3, Section C, all of Section B and Questions 23-25 of Section A) the following recommendations are made.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-1 Year)
That the goals and objectives of the library be defined, articulated and communicated to all staff members.

Discussion:
An all-staff meeting would be a valuable way for employees to give feedback and ask questions. The goal should include the call for excellence.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-1 Year)
That an in-depth evaluation of existing workloads and job descriptions be done to insure as equal a distribution of work as possible, for all staff members.

Discussion:
Special attention should be given to employees doing work above their level without compensation for it, employees who are overloaded with unnecessary duties, and employees whose skills could be put to better use. The results of such an inventory should include revised or rewritten job descriptions, with clearly defined separation between Librarian and Library Assistant duties.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-1 Year)
That library procedures be evaluated as to their effectiveness.

Discussion:
Special procedures that need looking into are: control mechanisms for employees who abuse break, lunch, vacation, sick leave; employees who do not fulfill their job descriptions (but who get satisfactory reviews); and inter-departmental communication channels. Appropriate application of reclassification, merit increases, and promotions should also be established and maintained.

MOTIVATION

Motivation is defined as the degree to which people are willing to work. Employees who are motivated and productive must have a high degree of interest in their work and must also derive a large amount of satisfaction from their job. (Collins) Motivation can come from within an employee, but it is the job of Administrators and Supervisors to create an atmosphere conducive to motivation, as well as supplying some external motivators. (Quick; Bradford; Rosenbaum)

Salaries and bonuses have long been seen as prime motivators, but recent studies have proven that this is not necessarily true. Some of the strongest motivators cost an organization nothing, but can drastically improve both individual and collective employee motivation.

Motivation should not be confused with rewards, although the two are often connected. Rewards can be motivators, but they are usually just short-term motivators, not on-going or continual motivators.

Recognition is seen as a prime motivator. Recognition can take the form of a reward, but it is most often the result of praise from a superior or co-worker. This does not mean praise in the annual evaluation, but praise immediately following a job worthy of such. Recognition is usually verbal, but can be a written commendation in special cases. (Dittman; Nave; Cherrington; Richardson) In Part II of the OCS Questionnaire, in answers to Questions A, B and D, many employees responded that praise, recognition and thank you's would be valued. Only in two cases was money mentioned as a motivator.

Effective communication is essential for employee motivation. (Collins) Supervisors and Administrators must be open, honest, and approachable while employees must have respect for and belief in their superiors. Feedback is important, and the ability to listen well is also vital for both employees and management. If an organization's channels of communication are blocked, slow, or unreliable, recognition loses much of its motivating power. (Becker) Other important aspects of motivation is a pleasant physical environment, challenge and creativity in the job, and allowing employees as much authority over their job as possible.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-1 Year)
That Supervisors and Administrators at all levels within the library be encouraged to give praise and recognition to employees whenever it's earned.

Discussion:
A "thank you" or acknowledgement of a job well done can mean much to an employee, who then feels valued as a part of the organization. Recognition should be delivered on its own, not mixed in with criticism or general conversation, or it can lose it's value as a motivator.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-1 Year)
That classes in motivation techniques and evaluation techniques be required for all Supervisors and Adminstrators.

Discussion:
At this time, the existing evaluation procedures should be reviewed to make sure that they are consistent throughout the library. Performance standards should be clearly communicated to employees at the beginning of a review cycle to insure that they know what is expected of them.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-1 Year)
That guidelines be established for written commendations for employees who do their job in a manner consistent with the call for excellence, or who take on special projects or assignments in addition to their regular job.

Discussion:
When such commendation is earned, a copy should be given to the employee and a second copy included in his personnel file.

RECOMMENDATION IV: (0-1 Year)
That guidelines for advancement be communicated to all staff members, so that employees know what channels are available to them.

Discussion:
Supervisors should also encourage exceptional employees to seek out new career opportunities when the employee is interested.

RECOMMENDATION V: (0-1 Year)
That a program be established that allows employees the chance to do work not normally in their job description.

Discussion:
This could be a job rotation or split assignment, or even a staff sharing program for a certain length of time for interested employees who have been at the top of their range for a minimum of 3 years with a consistently high performance

evaluation rating. This would allow employees the chance to learn new skills, as well as adding variety to their work pattern.

RECOMMENDATION VI: (0-1 Year)
That the possibility of establishing an EMPLOYEE-OF-THE-MONTH program be investigated.

Discussion:
Such a program could have two levels, one for Academic Staff and another for Classified Staff, with a maximum of two employees at each level being chosen each month. Deserving employees should be nominated by their Supervisors or a co-worker, with support coming from at least 2 other employees (of any level) who deal with the nominated employee on a regular basis. The program could emphasize employees who have been at the top of their range for at least one year, but not be limited to such. Any employee deserving of special recognition should be eligible. A certificate could be given to the employee as well as mention in a staff newsletter.

TOP OF RANGE EMPLOYEES
(CLASSIFIED STAFF)

One current problem (and a continuing future morale problem) are staff who remain at the top of their range/classification over a long period of time, or staff who are in dead end jobs. This problem is becoming increasingly more serious as the staffing in the library is remaining stable with few openings and opportunities for advancement, especially in upper-level positions.

The scope of this problem is shown in the negative staff response to Question 7 of Part I on the OCS Questionnaire. 51.83% of the staff answered that hard work and accomplishment "seldom" or "never" are keys to advancement in the library.

This problem was also addressed in Question D of Part II with the staff making many recommendations from as little as a simple spoken "thank you" to time-off or cash bonus to help ameliorate the problem of low morale among top of the range staff.

Although a Special Service Award program for classified staff at the top of their range for at least one year, was instituted at the University over 7 years ago, it seems to have done little to help morale in the library. As addressed many times in Question D of Part II, the Special Service Award has actually created greater problems and in turn lowered morale. This is partly due to a lack of information communicated to the staff by the Administration and a seemingly unfair system (possibly seen this way due to the lack of communication) as to how this award is distributed throughout various library departments.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-5 Years)
The true nature, intent and guidelines for the Special Service Award need to be clarified and made known (via a memo) to all staff. When changes are made these updates also need to be circulated.

Discussion:
Communication can help solve some of the misunderstanding concerning this award although it will not guarantee that resentment among those not receiving the award will stop.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-5 Years)
An ad hoc representative library committee to help guarantee that the Special Service Awards are being distributed and awarded in an equitable manner.

Discussion:
With written and known guidelines and a committee of their peers to try and guarantee fairness, the validity of these awards can be reestablished and their being given will help not hurt the morale.

This committee could act in an ombudsman-like role with clarification and information to help those feeling resentment against those receiving the award.

This committee would not decide who would get the award, but would act as a safeguard to fairness and equity, and would be an informational source concerning the Special Service Award.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-5 Years)
Other areas need to be researched to help morale for staff at the top of their range, or who are in dead end positions.

Discussion:
In their answers to Question D of Part II the staff offerred many suggestions to help this problem. Many of the suggestions were ones which would cost the library nothing, such as oral praise, written praise in the form of personal notes or write-ups concerning good work and projects in the in-house newsletter (S/R), job rotation, special projects, variant or special schedules, long lunch hours on special occasions, being shown something new i.e., P.C., and the opportunity to serve on committees.

Other suggestions were at a cost to the library although not all were very costly. Some of these are flowers, small gifts, Special Service Award, cards, freebies, i.e., tickets for movies, free day-off on birthday or anniversary at work, library support and time off for classes, workshops, seminars and conferences, monetary bonus, piece of furniture or equipment,and being taken to lunch or dinner.

Because at present, few of the "free" types of appreciation are being shown by supervisors or department heads, it seems that alone they would not be enough to help those with low morale. As stated in one answer "money does talk," however, not all awards/rewards need to cost the library anything more than a personal committment to the people working for it. If staff felt personally aappreciated they would not look only to tangible rewards for satisfaction in their job.

REWARDS

A reward is a tangible recognition for work done to a specified, above-average level. It can also be given to acknowledge the value of an employee who has been with the organization for a long period of time. Rewards are short-term motivators, and where motivation should be an on-going recognition of an employee's value and level of performance, a reward is an isolated, tangible acknowledgement of performance of a specific task or for performance during a specific span of time. (Nave)

Rewards can take many forms, including a monetary bonus, a special luncheon or dinner, a pin or plaque. A reward does not have to be monetary to be effective. In fact, many surveys have shown money as being lower in the rankings of preferred rewards than would be expected. (Quick)

A list of possible rewards follows the recommendations. This list was compiled from suggestions within the literature and from Part II of the OCS Questionnaire. These are only suggestions, not necessarily the only possibilities. Further studies of the literature and consultation with other organizations with effective reward programs would be valuable.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-1 Year)
That a reward program be set up within the library following guidelines established by Library Administration and agreed upon by library staff.

Discussion:
Some guidelines to be considered are rewards divided into categories for different levels of staff, top-of-range employees, and performance levels. Monetary rewards could possibly be limited to employees who have been at the top of their range for 5 years or more.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-2 Years)
That employees be allowed to choose their reward from several options, since all employees are not necessarily "rewarded" by the same thing; some may prefer movie tickets to flowers, for example.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-1 Year)
That any reward program implemented be open to all employees who have a minimum of 1 year of at least satisfactory performance with the library.

Discussion:
Some rewards can be limited to special categories (as mentioned above), but the program as a whole should be library-wide. Rewards should be given out either monthly or quarterly; except monetary rewards, which should be given out at the annual review of the employee who earns it.

REWARDS

*** Special projects *** Job rotation *** Praise/recognition *** Variant or alternate schedules *** Long lunch hours or shorter days *** A special day off (birthday, anniversary) *** Flower or small gift *** Special Service Award *** Card or certificate *** Plaque or pin *** Lottery tickets *** Movie passes *** New furniture or equipment *** Discount at special events *** Social events *** Money or cash bonus *** Library support (time and money) for a class, seminar, workshop, etc. *** Mention in a staff newsletter or special memo *** Luncheon or breakfast with Library Administration and/or Department Head *** Special notice or commendation included in personnel file *** Opportunity to serve on a committee if interested.

SOCIAL EVENTS

Social events, whether on work time or non-work time, have long been a way of encouraging employee interaction and improving morale. However, social contact can be beneficial in more ways than these.

In a social atmosphere, employees have the opportunity to get to know each other in a non-work context, meet new people, and reaffirm friendships. Tensions that exist in the work place are usually absent in a social context.

Social events allow communication channels to open, as people are more likely to approach someone at work if they have spoken to them before. Social activities also allow personal identities to be acknowledged- people are seen as individuals, not just identified as "someone who works here". Barriers of rank can be diminished as well, which often carries over into the work place, decreasing friction between employees of different levels.

By establishing, maintaining and encouraging social contact between employees, Administrators show that people are important as people, not only as workers. Administrators get the chance to know employees on a first name, personal basis. Various types of events can be attractive in recruiting potential employees, motivating current employees, or just promoting a team feeling within the organization. (Nave; Becker; Eason)

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-2 Years)
That a committee consisting of volunteers from all levels of library staff be established to investigate the practicality of suggested social events.

Discussion:
The committee should research various suggestions in terms of popularity, support, cost, and preparation. Ideas and suggestions can come from employees, the committee itself, literature, and examples from other organizations. Approved suggestions should be implemented, and a record maintained for reference. Some suggestions follow:

1. HOLDIAY PARTY: Assign departments, on a rotational basis, each of the following categories: beverages, appetizers, main dishes, desserts, decorations, clean-up, and entertainment.

2. PICNIC: There were many responses in Part II of the OCS Questionnaire that the picnic held last year was fun, and should be repeated.

3. END-OF-THE-YEAR-DANCE: Based on the end of the school or fiscal year. A band or "traveling DJ" could be hired to supply the music. Not a dinner, just appetizers or beverages brought by volunteers or catered.

4. LIBRARY TEAM SPORTS: Some exist now, but they should be expanded and more widely promoted. The library could challenge other campus departments, S.B. and Goleta businesses, and other area colleges.

5. CHARTERED TRIPS: Organized by the library, but employees pay the group price for weekend/day skiing, camping or island trips; concerts and plays in Los Angeles; etc. The YMCA currently offers this service for both members and non-members, and they could be consulted as to the effectiveness and interest in such a program.

6. DEPARTMENTAL or LIBRARY OPEN HOUSE: Held periodically, perhaps once or twice a year.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The physical environment of offices has been given very little attention and is one of the most vaguely understood aspects of management in organizational behavior. (Davis)

Space, or the lack of workspace, noise level, temperature variables, aesthetics, comfort, furniture, equipment, level of cleanliness, arrangement and location of workspace, all can affect productivity and work through affecting the morale of the staff.

Although responses to these components are individual and subjective in nature, they still need to be addressed. Taken individually these negative factors can be easily ignored, but their demoralizing effect is compounded when more than one detractor is experienced or occurs over a period of time.

In response to Question 10 of Part I of the OCS Questionnaire 51.10% of the staff felt that the current physical environment did not make the library a pleasant place in which to work. This is compared to 39.42% who felt the physical environment did make the library a pleasant place.

Furniture and equipment were mentioned quite often as types of rewards in Question D of Part II. This is also an indication that the phsyical environment is important and there is room for improvement in the library's physical environment.

RECOMMENDATION I: (0-5 Years)
Institute a system of request or complaint forms to be used to submit requests for new furniture and equipment, or for repairs, adjustments and corrections to existing problems and conditions (such as problems with air, temperature, lighting or cleanliness).

Discussion:
These forms should go through appropriate channels and be initialed and approved or denied, (as is the current practice with requests for "leave without pay" forms), and then should go back to the individual who initiated the request or complaint. Forms should go up and down through the proper channels, whether or not the problem is corrected of the furniture or equipment is approved for purchase.

Whatever the outcome or decision it should be put into writing on this form. This will acknowledge to the individual that his requests have gone through the proper channels and can serve as

proof, if necessary, that requests or complaints are being ignored.

RECOMMENDATION II: (0-5 Years)
When the annual furniture or equipment requests are solicited by the Administration, this information needs to be disseminated to staff at all levels, possibly through a memo or an article in Schedule & Report.

Discussion:
Currently staff input is not sought by all Department Heads. Staff also need to be aware that not all requests can or will be granted.

RECOMMENDATION III: (0-5 Years)
Look into ways of using new furniture or equipment as part of an award or reward program.

Discussion:
Preferential status for requests made during the "annual equipment request period" could be given to staff whose performance is outstanding or who are at the top of their range. (see Recommendation II)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert F. and Charlotte Kraft, THE ORGANIZATIONAL UNCONSCIOUS, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Atkinson, Hugh C., "Strategies for Change: Part II," LIBRARY JOURNAL, March 15, 1984. p.556-557.

Beck, Arthur C. and Ellis D. Hillmar, "What Managers Can Do To Turn Around Negative Attitudes in an Organization," MANAGEMENT REVIEW, January 1984. p.22-25.

Becker Christine, "Building Relationships Through Communication:," PUBLIC MANAGEMENT, July 1984. p.6.

Becker, Franklin, "The Efficacious Office," WORKING WOMAN, August 1982. p.55-59.

Bradford, David L. and Allan R. Cohen, MANAGING FOR EXCELLENCE, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1984.

Cherrington, David J. and B. Jackson Wixom, Jr. "Recognition is Still a Top Motivator," PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, May 1983. p.87-91.

Coil, Ann, "Job Matching Brings Out the Best in Employees," PERSONNEL JOURNAL, January 1984. p.54-60.

Collins, John F., "How to Motivate Your Employees," NATION'S BUSINESS, December 1982. p.48-50.

Davis, Tim R.V., "The Influence of the Physical Environment in Offices," JOURNAL OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION, Volume 5(4) Winter 1984. p.91-111.

De Gennaro, Richard, "Theory VS. Practice in Library Management," LIBRARY JOURNAL, July 1983. p.1318-1321.

Dewar, Donald L., THE QUALITY CIRCLE GUIDE TO PARTICIPATION MANAGEMENT," Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Digerness, Bobbi, "Color it Productive," ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, Volume 13, December 1982. p.16-19.

Dittman, James B., "Let's Hear it for Recognition!" SALES & MARKETING MANAGEMENT, September 10, 1984. p.118-124.

Dodge, L. Delf, PhD and V. Jean Ramsey PhD, "Employee Motivation Expectancy Theory at Work," JOURNAL OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION, Volume 1(3), Fall 1980. p.43-54.

Dunham, Randall B. and Jon L. Pierce, "The Design and Evaluation of Alternative Work Schedules," PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, April 1983. p.67-75.

Eason, Henry, "Keeping Good People," NATION'S BUSINESS, July 1984. p.37-39.

Goodman, Paul S. and Associates, CHANGES IN ORGANIZATIONS, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Higham, Norman, THE LIBRARY IN THE UNIVERSITY, Boulder, CO, Westview Press, 1980.

Hill, James W. PhD, "A Model for Staff Development," JOURNAL OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION, Volume 1(1), Spring 1980. p.31+.

Hinrichs, John R., THE MOTIVATION CRISIS: WINDING DOWN AND TURNING OFF, New York, AMACOM, 1974.

Hyman, Mel, "The People Factor," BUILDINGS, Volume 78, March 1981. p.70-72.

Kilman, Ralph H., BEYOND THE QUICK FIX: FIVE TRACKS TO ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Krausz, Moshe and Nechama Friebach, "Effects of Flexible Working Time for Employed Women Upon Satisfaction, Strains, and Absenteeism," JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, Volume 56, June 1983. p.155-159.

Lippitt, Gordon L., Petter Langseth and Jack Mossop, IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Lynch, Beverly P. and JoAnn Verdin, "Job Satisfaction in Libraries: Relationships of the Work Itself, Age, Sex, Occupational Group, Tenure, Supervisory Level, Career Committment, and Library Department," LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Volume 53, No. 4, October 1983. p.434-447.

Marchant, Maurice P., PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press, 1976.

Martell, Charles, "Improving the Effectiveness of Libraries Through Improvements in the Quality of Working Life," COLLEGE & RESEARCH LIBRARIES, Volume 42, September 1981. p.435-446.

Martell, Charles, "QWL Strategies," THE JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP, November 1984. p.286-289.

Martell, Charles, "QWL Strategies: People are the Castle, People are the Walls, People are the Moat,"THE JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP, Volume 10, No. 6, January 1985. p.350-354.

Martell, Charles and Mercedes Untawale, "Work Enrichment for Academic Libraries," THE JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP, Volume 8, No. 6, January 1983. p.339-343.

Meer, Jeff, "The Light Touch," PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, September 1985. p.60-67.

Melohn, Thomas H., "How to Build Employee Trust and Productivity," HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, January/February 1983. p.56-61.

Mourey, Deborah A., "Quality Circles for Management Decisions: What's in it for Libraries," SPECIAL LIBRARIES, April 1984. p.87-94.

Nave, James L. and Bob Thomas, "How Companies Boost Morale," SUPERVISORY MANAGEMENT, October 1983. p.29-33.

Nollen, Stanley D. PhD, NEW WORK SCHEDULES IN PRACTICE, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1982.

Olmsted, Barney, "Changing Times: The Use of Reduced Work Time Options in the United States," INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW, Volume 122, No. 4, July/August, 1983. p.477-492.

ORGANIZATION THEORY: SELECTED READINGS, England, Penguin Books, 1979.

Page-Jones, Meilir, "Staff Development Requires Education, Promotion and Motivation," DATA MANAGEMENT, October 1985, p.32+.

Pascarella, Perry, "Quality Circles Uncoil," INDUSTRY WEEK, April 30, 1984. p.16.

Peters, Thomas J. and Nancy Austin, A PASSION FOR EXCELLENCE, New York, Random House, 1985.

Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE, New York, Warner Books, 1982.

Quick, Thomas L., THE QUICK MOTIVATION METHOD, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Raudsepp, Eugene, "101 Ways to Spark Your Employees' Creative Potential," OFFICE ADMINISTRATION AND AUTOMATION, September, 1985. p.38+.

Richardson, David W., "Recognize Workers' Strengths to Help Improve Their Performance," MERCHANDISING WAY, May 1984. p.79-80.

Ronen, Simcha PhD, ALTERNATIVE WORK SCHEDULES, Illinois, Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984.

Ronen, Simcha PhD, FLEXIBLE WORKING HOURS, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Rosow, Jerome M., "New Work Schedules for a Changing Office," ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, February 1982. p.48+.

Rosow, Jermoe M. and Robert Zager, "Punch Out the Time Clocks," HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, March/April 1983. p.12+.

Saunders, Carol Stoak and Russell Saunders, "Effects of Flextime on Sick Leave, Vacation Leave, Anxiety, Performance, and Satisfaction in a Library Setting," LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Volume 55, No. 1, January 1985. p.71-88.

Schneider, Benjamin and Robert A. Snyder, "Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate," JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, Volume 60, No. 3, 1975. p.318-328.

Smith, Nathan M. and Veneese C. Nelson, "Helping May Be Harmful: The Implications of Burnout for the Special Librarian," SPECIAL LIBRARIES, January 1983. p.14-19.

Springer, T.J., "Remove the Impediments to People Performance," OFFICE, January 1981. p.114-120.

Turney, John R. and Stanley L. Cohen, "Alternative Work Schedules Increase Employee Satisfaction," PERSONNEL JOURNAL, March 1983. p.202-207.

Vaughn, William J. and J.D. Dunn, "A Study of Job Satisfaction In Six University Libraries," COLLEGE & RESEARCH LIBRARIES, May 1974. p.163-177.

Webber, Ross A., MANAGEMENT: BASIC ELEMENTS OF MANAGING ORGANIZATIONS, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin, 1979.

White, Herbert S., "Participative Management is the Answer, but What was the Question?" LIBRARY JOURNAL, August 1985. p.62-63.

Wittingslow, George E. and Barrie Mitcheson, "Job Satisfaction Among Library Staff," JOURNAL OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION, Volume 5(4), Winter 1984. p.61-68.

Goal IV
OCS Subcommittee on Communication

Introduction:

Communication is of major importance in all areas of an organization. Effective communication promotes high morale, job satisfaction, cooperation, teamwork, and unrestrictive exchange of information. Communication is the vehicle that brings nourishment to all facets of the the organization, keeping it healthy.

Objective 1: Characterize communication in the UCSB library and evaluate the effectiveness.

The UCSB Library has many forms of communication in use in the system. The forms include policy statements, procedural statements, memorandum, minutes, newsletters, and meetings. The means and content vary dramatically throughout the library.

In an attempt to identify the effect on the organization of these lines of communication, certain questions were developed for the OCS Questionnaire.

The OCS Questionnaire is included in the Appendix of this report. Questions concerning communication are in Part 1, Section B. Many people's comments from Part 2 were relevant to the subject of communication and their ideas incorporated into our recommendations. The results of the questionnaire in the area of communication are discussed in the recommendations (statistics cited come from the Librarywide Questionnaire).

Objective 2: Study methods and models used for successful communication of timely information.

It is clear from the literature that effective communication depends on understood and meaningful objectives and goals. The members of the organization must have a full understanding of these goals and be willing to cooperate and coordinate duties to form a library team. (Brown, 1985)

As the library moves into new areas of technology and changes in job assignment, effective communication will be a necessity.

Methodology:

The subcommittee reviewed the literature and listed selected works in the bibliography. Of great importance was the OCS Questionnaire including the comment section. Reports from library study teams of other libraries were reviewed. The subcommittee interviewed two people: Cecily Johns, AUL-Services and Judy Guillermo-Newton, Employee Support Counselor.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.
LIBRARY GOALS and OBJECTIVES

Goals and objectives must be developed on a library wide basis. These goals become the framework needed to build a productive communication system. The goals set the purpose (what), the tone (how), the reason (why), and the timing (when) for communication to take place.

Recommendation

The management team of the library should develop public and operational goals and objectives. Both the larger mission statement of the entire library as well as the goals in the area of communication need to be determined and disseminated. When individual departments identify with the mission statement of the library, they can communicate knowing that the common goal is shared by all. (Johns, Guillermo-Newton)

Discussion

In the OCS Questionnaire, 58.39% responded "No" when asked if they knew the goals, objectives, and priorities of the library. The result is slightly better when asked if the goals, objectives and priorities of the department are known (51.09%; Section B. 10 and 11). Based on the literature and interviews it seems that few improvements in the area of communications can take place until the goals (both broad and specific) are understood and shared by all concerned.

Time Frame

This is the first step in improving the communication in the library. Serious consideration must be given to developing these goals and their dissemination. It is a difficult step to take and must be done with care. A timeframe needed to complete such as task could be: 0 to 6 months - developing goal statement; 6 months to 1 year - testing goal statement; and 2 to 3 years - reevaluation of goal statement.

2.
MANAGEMENT STYLE

Management style impacts upon communication up and down the line structure. Identifying and encouraging similar management styles in the line structure will contribute to effective communication and accountability for communication. (Guillermo-Newton)

Recommendation

A definite communication style of library management should be determined. Top level library administrators need to develop a mode of communication which is compatible with their management style, then state that mode clearly to middle managers with an understanding that they will be held accountable for such communication. (Joh

Discussion

The literature on communication repeatedly emphasizes the effect that management has on communication throughout the organization. An unclear, untimely high level communicator will negatively affect all levels below who are dependent upon his/her information to relay it elsewhere. Conversely, when information is relayed openly, regularly, and on time to middle managers, it enables and encourages like communication up and down the line structure. As communication is freed between ranks, it has been proven that less effective communicators are easily spotted. At this point, action must be taken to determine why communication is discontinued with particular persons, and to rectify that situation with training and developing the necessary communication skills.

Time Frame

Determining a management communication style within the UCSB Library should be undertaken and completed within six months. This style could than be reflected throughout the library and clearly felt within one year of its onset. Determining the system failures and correcting them would take one to two years.

Total time taken for Management's Communication Style to be uniform throughout the library: 3 1/2 years.

3.
DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS

As in any evolving organization, there is a need to continue to develop and test communication skills.

Recommendation

The management team must evolve methods to develop communication skills needed to support the stated goals and objectives that are consistant with management communication style. The University provides a wide range of classes in communication. Support of the campus program should continue and be ongoing without specific time limitations. In areas where special programs are needed to support change and team building, an outside consultant should be used. (The OCS Questionnaire Section 21i shows great support for retraining: 51.09% essential; 32.85% desirable.)

Discussion

The literature shows that communication style is generated from the top. The style of communication of the top management team is reflected down the line. Middle management must communicate in the manner needed to support the top management style. A poor communicator in a gatekeeper role will restrict the flow of timely and accurate communication. Training is one way to correct this problem. Once such training is clearly supported by the top, a strong message is sent down the line. Also, gatekeepers can be held accountable now that the tools of good communication are made available to them. Training also provides a forum to discuss communication failures and identify the manner to prevent reoccurance of a failure.

Results from the OCS Questionnaire support the statement that communication within a limited area (department or unit) is generally good (43.07% are well informed about decisions in own department; Section B 2a). This is interesting when compared to the results of other questions concerning the channels of communication. Although the response to the questions concerning the formal lines of communication as an effective means of communication was mixed (21.17% agree, 29.93% neutral, and 29.20% disagree; Section B 15) the feeling that the channels of communication were ineffective was high (48.91%; Section B 1). Training can bring about bridging techniques to improve lateral as well as stratified communication.

Time Frame

After the development of Library goals and management style, areas that need special training should be targeted. This includes problem areas of communication, technological changes, and reorganizational actions. Communication training should be designed with these special problems in mind. Evaluation of the programs should be conducted at regular intervals to realign the training process as is needed. General communication classes should be on-going. Total time requirement: 2-5 years

4.
MEETINGS / FORUMS:

Periodic meetings of departments, regular meetings of units and established networks need to be mandated. Training (in house or out) for effective meeting skills should be encouraged.

RECOMMENDATION:

The frequency of meetings should be mandated from library administration in their stated communication style. As a basic guideline, personal interviews as well as the OCS survey show the following minimum needs: 1) Library-wide meetings to be held quarterly,(OCS Questionnaire, Section B13) 2) Departmental meetings to be held monthly (OCS Questionnaire, Section B12), and 3) Unit meetings to be held on a regular basis.

Discussion

Meetings and forums are extremely effective ways of passing information to a large number of people in a short amount of time. However a warning must be made against the meeting person presenting a planned monologue without soliciated comments and open discussion. Then, any unsolicited comments or questions asked are usually confrontational in nature and thereby begin the communication breakdown. A forum is defined as an assembly for the opportunity to openly discuss public matters or current questions. This must occur for effective communication to transpire. Minutes of meetings / forums can be issued at a later date to reinforce what was said to those in attendance, and to inform those unable to attend of what was said.

Many people are more at ease with verbal communication than with written communication. Thereby lies the failure in having only written communication in an organization -- it sometimes discourages responses. In an interview with a professional communications specialist, it was stated that an organization with excessive written communications is the clearest sign of an organization which is uncomfortable in communicating and has a severe morale problem. (Guillermo-Newton)

Meetings can range in size from two people on up to and including all employees. The larger numbers of people in a meeting do require greater organization and leadership on the part of the chairperson (i.e., Dept. Head, Unit Head, Supervisor).

Meetings / forums are only effective if timely, honest, and clear. Although this may sound simple, it frequently is not. Training to develop effective meeting skills should be mandatory (OCS Questionnaire, Section C211), and a method of evaluating those skills instituted into performance evaluations. (Johns)

Time Frame

The development and training of all persons able to lead meetings will be a massive task and could take up to two years to schedule and complete. After that, ineffectiveness will be readily noticeable within one year and can be dealt with at that time. Total time requirement: three years.

5.
INTERNAL NEWSLETTER

The OCS Questionnaire as well as the interviews (Johns, Guillermo-Newton) support an informative, internal communication device of the organization to provide specific, accurate, and timely information.

Recommendation

The management team should develop an internal communication device that provides timely, clear, honest, and accurate information to all members within the library.

Discussion

There is support and interest within the management team to develop a inhouse newsletter that is purposely designed for staff readership. Given the developments of new technologies, this tool could become a menu driven online inhouse data bank using the department's terminal. With such a menu, information from a variety of sources could be browsed. For example, the agenda for Department Heads Meeting could be on the menu. The agenda could be the menu for the minutes for the same meeting which could be reviewed if desired. Meeting reports, etc. could be available for a specific period of time. News items would also be included in a section. If the software is not available at this time, a printed inhouse newsletter published on a regular interval is a necessity to keep communication flowing throughout the library.

To keep the tool viable, there could be a rotation of editors. The editor would receive a percentage of release time from other duties in order to handle the responsibility.

Time Frame

An ad hoc committee should be appointed to consider recommendations from the employees and management from all levels. The pilot project should be begun and tried for one year. Total time frame: 1 year, three months

6.
NEW EMPLOYEE CHECKLIST:

Develop ways to communicate basic performance information to all new employees.

RECOMMENDATION

New employees of the UCSB Library have certain rights to written information pertaining to their particular job and performance evaluation. A checklist should be developed to ensure that employees know what they are entitled to, and can obtain any missing items. This checklist should be given to the new employee on his / her first day of employment by Library Personnel. At the end of a month, Library Personnel would check with the new employee to see if all material is at hand.

A checklist should include, but not be limited to:

1) Current job description
2) Training manual
3) Performance Standards
4) Organizational chart of the library, department, and unit
5) Time chart of when performance standards and evaluations are to be written
6) Personnel manual
7) Union contract where applicable
8) Library floorplan
9) List of regular library documents available to interested employees and where they can be read
10) List of UCSB benefits
11) Abbreviated campus phone directory
12) Outline of campus employee support program

Time frame

The new employee checklist should be drawn from staff recommendations as to its content and issued within six months.

7.
INTRACAMPUS / INTERCAMPUS COMMUNICATION

Effective communication needs to be developed throughout the University Community: both intra and inter University areas.

RECOMMENDATION:

Improving lateral communication between UC campus libraries must become a high level priority and University Librarians should be responsible for communicating changes.

Discussion

It appears that communications on the UC-wide level are not transmitted downward or laterally to all levels of staff. This is true within the university (department to library) as well as without (university to university). Communication between teaching or research departments and the library must be maintained as well as communication among the University Libraries.

Focusing on developing communication at these levels should be studied to develop improved communication channels. Timely, honest, and clear communication will be returned with like communication and open channels heretofore closed. To simplify access to this vast amount of information, electronic coding by campus, department, and topic should be explored with a UC-wide electronic mail system. The learning process from sending and receiving new information will be immediately rewarding to those participating and will help set an example of efficiency which will be unanimously followed.

Time Frame

Optimal time frame: five years.

8.
COMMUNICATION COORDINATOR

RECOMMENDATION

Establish the responsibility for developing communication frameworks, coordinating information interactions, maintaining necessary systems, and controlling library communications in a staff appointment.

Discussion

As a staff assignment (outside the formal line structure and appointed in a non-librarian / library assistant series), this type of function could provide an avenue for venting, help in determining accountability, facilitate improved developments in communication, and develop evaluation of communication programs. It also could allow for confidential upward feedback presently missing from current system.

A person with this assignment could have additional duties: developing training programs, career counseling, and editing the inhouse newsletter. Using the additional FTE assigned as UCSB grows for this position, could be the major factor in improving the communication structure of the library.

Time Frame

Develop an ad hoc committee to consider developing such an appointment. If study warrants it, appoint as an intern with the goal of creating improved communication. 1-3 years.

References

BOOKS

Brown University. OMS Public Service Study. Communication section. 1984.

Hunt, Gary T. Communication skills in the organization. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1980 (HD 30.3 H86)

McClure, Charles R. Information for academic library decision making: the case for organizational information assessment. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1980. (Z 675 U5 M18)

Rauch, William V. Corporate communications: a comparison of Japanese and American practices. Westport, Conn., Quorum Books, 1984. (HD 30.3 R82 1984UCB)

Smith, Paul I. Job involvement and communications. London, Business Books, 1973.

Stueart, Robert D. Library management. Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1977. (Z 678.9 S25 1983)

Vardaman, George T. Managerial control through communication; systems for organizational diagnosis and design. New York, Wiley, 1968. (HF 5549.5 C6 V36)

JOURNALS

Collins, John F. "How to motivate your employees," Nation's Business December:48-50, 1982.

Euster, Joanne R. "Changing patterns in internal communication in large academic libraries," Occasional paper number 6, Association of Research Libraries, 1981.

Dalehanty, Thomas. "A method for the prescriptive assessment of the flow of information within organizations," Management Science, 28:910-924, 1982.

D'Aprix, Roger. "The oldest (and best) way to communicate with employees," Harvard Business Review, September-October:30-32, 1982.

Driver, Russel W. "Issues in upward communication," Supervisory Management, pp10-13, 1980.

Foltz, Roy G. "Learning to speak with one voice," Public Relations Journal, pp9-31, 1982.

Foltz, Roy, "Survey shows communication problems," Personnel Administrator February:8, 1983.

Greenbaum, H.H "Organizational structure and communication process: a study of change," Group and Organization Studies 8:61-82, 1983. (HM 134 G73)

Harris, Stanley. "Creating a committee workforce," Management Today, May:121, 1984.

Hyman, J. "Where communication schemes fall short of intention," Personnel Management, 14(3):30-33, 1982.

Kaplin, Robert E. "Intervention in a loosely organized system: an encounter with non-being," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18:415-432, 1982.

Lewis, Carl B. "How to make internal communications work," Public Relations Journal, pp14-17, 1980.

Monge, P.R. "Determinants of communication network involvement: connectedness and integration," Group and Organization Studies 8:83-111. (HM 134 G73)

More, E. "Modern technology and organizational communication implications for management," Journal of Information Science, 7:169, 1983.

Mornan, R.S. "Why internal communication is failing," Public Relations Journal, March:15-17, 1983.

Ressler, J. A. "Crisis communication," Public Relations Quarterly, Fall:8-10, 1982.

St. John, W.D. "Successful communication between supervisors and employees," Personnel Journal January:71-77, 1983 (HM 1 P4766)

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION AND STAFFING
QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ THE INFORMATION BELOW CAREFULLY

THE TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION AND STAFFING NEEDS YOUR OPINIONS. Your answers, and those of others, will help us make recommendations about the future of this Library that are relevant to your needs and aspirations as a Library employee. Please feel assured about the anonymity of your answers. This questionnaire will be administered and tabulated by the Social Processes Research Institute. After data tabulation, the completed questionnaires will be destroyed. No one from the Library will see anything except the statistical results and comments. The statistical results will be made available to all UCSB Library employees.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer each applicable statement or question. In the case of AUL's or department heads, statements or questions about the department head refer to the University Librarian; the supervisor refers to the individual to whom you report. For those employees with split assignments, please interpret the words "department head" to mean the primary department head, and the word "supervisor" to mean the primary supervisor.

PART I

A. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

DIRECTIONS: Place an X before the word which most closely represents your opinion.

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: ___(01)very high, ___(02) high, ___(03) low, ___(04) very low, ___ (05) o.k., ___ (06) don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: ___(01) very high, ___(02) high, ___(03) low, ___(04) very low, ___ (05) o.k., ___(06) don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: ___(01) very high, ___(02) high, ___(03) low, ___(04) very low, ___ (05) o. k., ___(06) don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

a. expressed confidence in your abilities? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ___(03)seldom, ____(04) not at all

c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ____(04)not at all

d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? ___(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

f. refused or avoided helping you? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ___(04)not at all

g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ____(04)not at all

h. appeared ignorant about your work? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ____(04)not at all

i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? ___(01)often, ___(02)sometimes, ___(03)seldom, ___(04)not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your immediate SUPERVISOR:

a. expressed confidence in your abilities? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ___(03)seldom, ____(04) not at all

c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ____(04)not at all

d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? ____(01) often, ____(02) sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? ___(01) (01) often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ___(04) not at all

f. refused or avoided helping you? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ___(04)not at all

g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03)seldom, ____(04)not at all

h. appeared ignorant about your work? ____(01)often, ____(02)sometimes, ____(03) seldom, ____(04) not at all

i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? ___(01)often, ___(02)sometimes, ___(03)seldom, ___(04)not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library?. ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, __(04) seldom, ____(05) never, ____(06) don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? ____(01) always, ____(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, ___ (04) seldom, ____(05) never, ____(06) don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? ___(01)always, ___(02)usually, ___(03) sometimes, ____(04) seldom, ____(05) never, ____(06) don't know

9. How often to do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system, (e. g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, ____(04) seldom, ____(05) never, ____(06) dont't know

DIRECTIONS: In the following statements indicate how much you agree or disagree by using the following code: 01 = strongly agree, 02 = agree, 03 = neither agree nor disagree/don't know, 04 = disagree, 05 = strongly disagree

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g. the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work. ___(01),___(02), ___ (03), ___(04), ___(05)

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

(Note: 01=strongly agree, 02=agree, 03=neither agree nor disagree,don't know, 04=disagree, 05=strongly)

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently. ___(01), ___(02, ___(03),___(04), ___(05)

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

15. IF your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04),___(05)

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

26. Everything considered, I really like my job. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

B. COMMUNICATION

DIRECTIONS: Place an X before the word which most closely represents your opinion.

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication within the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: ___(01) very effective, ___(02) satisfactory, ___(03), ineffective, ___(04) don't know.

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. Your DEPARTMENT? ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, ___(04) seldom, ___(05) never

   b. OTHER library departments? ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, ___(04) seldom, ___(05) never.

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03) sometimes, ___(04) seldom, ___(05) never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine? ___(01)always, ___(02)usually, ___(03)sometimes, ___(04)seldom, ___(05)never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? ___(01) always, ___(02) usually, ___(03)sometimes, ___(04)seldom, ___(05) never

5. How often do you receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion? ___(01)always, ___(02)usually, ___(03)sometimes, ___(04)seldom, ___(05)never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your department head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work related problems.

   ___(01) personality differences make it difficult to talk
   ___(02) the supervisor often isn't around
   ___(03) the supervisor often seems too busy
   ___(04) the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
   ___(05) the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
   ___(06) you don't want to bother your supervisor
   ___(07) the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
   ___(08) not applicable
   ___(09) other, please specify _____

   _____

   _____

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work related problems.

___(01) personality differences make it difficult to talk
___(02) the department head often isn't around
___(03) the department head often seems too busy
___(04) the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
___(05) the department head often seems in a negative mood
___(06) you don't want to bother your department head
___(07) your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
___(08) the department head seems not to encourage communication
___(09) not applicable
___(10) other, please specify _____

_____

_____

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

___(01) personality differences make it difficult to talk
___(02) they usually aren't around
___(03) they often seem too busy to be disturbed
___(04) they appear uninterested in new ideas
___(05) they often seem to be in a negative mood
___(06) you don't want to bother them
___(07) your department head would consider it going over her/his head
___(08) they really don't encourage communication
___(09) not applicable
___(10) other, please specify _____

_____

_____

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment?___(01) yes, ___(02) no, ___(03) maybe, ___(04) don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me. ___(01) yes, ___(02)no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY. ___(01)yes, ___(02)no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings. ___(01) yearly, ___(02) quarterly, ___(03)monthly, ___(04)weekly, ___(05) not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings: ___(01) yearly, ___(02) twice a year, ___(03) quarterly, ___(04) monthly, ___(05) not at all

DIRECTIONS: In the following statements indicate how much you agree or disagree by using the following code: 01 = strongly agree, 02=agree, 03=neither agree nor disagree/don't know, 04=disagree, 05=strongly disagree

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant, and productive. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04),___(05)

C. STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

DIRECTIONS: Place an X before the word which most closely represents your opinion.

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: ___(01) too much, ___(02) just right, ___(03)not enough.

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: ___(01)too much, ___(02)just right, ___(03)not enough.

3. My workload is: ___(01) more than I can handle, ___(02) manageable, ___(03)not enough to keep me busy.

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: ____(01) execessive, ____(02) adequate, ___(03) inadequate, ___(04) don't know.

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: ___(01) excessive, ___(02) adequate, ___(03)inadequate, ___(04) don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? ____(01) increase it,___(02) have no effect, ____(03) decrease it, ____(04) don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? ____(01) increase it,____(02) remain the same, ____(03) decrease it, ____(04) don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? ____(01) increase it,___(02) remain the same, ____(03) decrease it, ____(04) don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? ___(01)high ___(02) moderate, ___(03)low, ___(04) none, ___(05) don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? ___(01) high, ___ (02) moderate, ___(03) low, ___(04)none, ___(05) don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? ___(01) high, ___ (02) moderate, ___(03) low, ___(04)none, ___(05) don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? ___(01) high, ___ (02) moderate, ___(03) low, ___(04)none, ___(05) don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? ___(01) high, ___ (02) moderate, ___(03) low, ___(04)none, ___(05) don't know

DIRECTIONS: In the following statements indicate how much you agree or disagree by using the following code: 01=strongly agree, 02=agree, 03=neither agree nor disagree/don't know, 04=disagree, 05=strongly disagree

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position.___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

18 There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgment in my job. ___(01), ___(02), ___(03), ___(04), ___(05)

DIRECTIONS: Place an X before the word or phrase which most closely represents your opinion.

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numeric databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end user access to bibliographic databases, etc. as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

b. split assignments (e.g. having work assignments in two or more departments) ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job) ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03) probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications, (e.g., computer programmers). ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

f. reassignment of duties. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

g. reassignment of personnel. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

h. reorganization of the library. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

i. active retraining programs. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

j. increasing the number of subject specialists. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists. ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement) ____ (01) essential, ____(02) desirable, ____(03)probably not necessary, ___(04) not needed, ____ (05) don't know

Directions: Check "Yes", if the following statements are true for you. Otherwise check "No".

1. My position is in an ACADEMIC series (e.g. Librarian) Yes_____ No _____

2. My position is in a CLASSIFIED STAFF series (e.g. Library Assistant). Yes_____ No_____

3. I hold one of the following positions: Department Head, AUL, or UL. Yes_____ No_____

4. The greater percentage of my time, or all my time, is spent working in one of the following Departments: Arts Library, Government Publications Department, Map and Imagery Laboratory, Reference Department, Sciences Engineering Library, Special Collections. Yes_____ No _____

January 1986

PART II: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

DIRECTIONS: Feel free to respond to these questions at this time and to return this section with the first section of questionnaire. However, if you prefer, you may keep these pages so that you can choose another more convenient time to write your opinions. If you choose this option, please complete this part of the questionnaire within TWO DAYS of your having completed the first part of the questionnaire. Send your answers in a sealed envelope addressed to the Social Processes Research Institute, 1312 Girvetz, ATTN: LIBRARY SURVEY by January 28.

We request that you print any handwritten answer. Use additional space on the back of the sheets, as needed. Please do not be personal or name individuals.

A. If you were the University Librarian, what three most important things would you do to improve morale in this library?

I. _____

II. _____

III. _____

B. If you were the University Librarian, what three most important things would you do to improve communication in the library?

I. _____

II. _____

III. _____

C. If you were the University Librarian, what three most important things would you do to make the Library's use of its employees more effective?

I. _____

II. _____

III. _____

D. Please list ways, not involving salary increases, that could be used to recognize or reward employees for outstanding work, creative ideas, taking initiative or other special accomplishments._____

E. Can you think of ways to improve cooperation between library assistants and librarians? If so, please list them.

January 1986

Response Data for the OCS Questionnaire

I. Response Data on Part I

137 career employees who completed Part I = 69% who completed Part I
---
200 career employees

36 academic employees who completed Part I = 71% who completed Part I
---
51 academic employees

98 staff employees who completed Part I = 66% who completed Part I
---
149 staff employees

11 management employees who completed Part I = 73% who completed Part I
---
15 mangement employees

48 Reference Services Departments employees responding = 37% from Reference Services Depts. responding to Q. 4
---
131 employees responding to question 4

83 Other Services responding = 63% from Other Services responding to Q. 4
---
131 employees responding to question 4

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: .73 very high 5.11 high 29.20 low 37.96 very low 13.87 ok 12.41 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 5.11 very high 21.17 high 27.74 low 24.82 very low 20.44 ok .73 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 9.49 very high 33.58 high 24.09 low 9.49 very low 16.79 ok 5.84 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 24.82 often 29.93 sometimes 25.55 seldom 17.52 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 44.53 often 33.58 sometimes 14.60 seldom 4.38 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 28.47 often 42.34 sometimes 16.79 seldom 10.22 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 20.44 often 21.17 sometimes 29.20 seldom 27.01 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 3.65 often 11.68 sometimes 24.09 seldom 58.39 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 8.76 often 10.95 sometimes 18.25 seldom 59.85 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 13.14 often 21.17 sometimes 17.52 seldom 45.99 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 18.98 often 23.36 sometimes 21.17 seldom 33.58 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 21.17 often 33.58 sometimes 24.82 seldom 17.52 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 34.31 often 17.52 sometimes 10.22 seldom 2.19 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 34.31 often 18.98 sometimes 6.57 seldom 4.38 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 28.47 often 21.90 sometimes 7.30 seldom 5.84 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 24.09 often 21.17 sometimes 9.49 seldom 9.49 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 1.46 often 10.95 sometimes 8.03 seldom 43.07 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 2.92 often 4.38 sometimes 10.22 seldom 45.99 not at all

g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 3.65 often 16.06 sometimes 9.49 seldom 33.58 not at all

h. appeared ignorant about your work? 6.57 often 8.76 sometimes 11.68 seldom 35.77 not at all

i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 26.28 often 21.90 sometimes 11.68 seldom 3.65 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 6.57 always 18.98 usually 23.36 sometimes 21.90 seldom 9.49 never 16.06 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 4.38 always 7.30 usually 20.44 sometimes 32.85 seldom 18.98 never 13.87 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? .73 always 4.38 usually 13.14 sometimes 42.34 seldom 24.09 never 12.41 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 1.46 always 5.11 usually 10.22 sometimes 40.15 seldom 18.25 never 21.90 don't kn

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 8.03 strongly agree 31.39 agree 9.49 neutral/don't know 39.42 disagree 11.68 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 42.34 strongly agree 48.91 agree 4.38 neutral/don't know 3.65 disagree .73 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 14.60 strongly agree 47.45 agree 10.22 neutral/don't know 20.44 disagree 5.84 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 2.92 strongly agree 22.63 agree 27.01 neutral/don't know 35.04 disagree 12.41 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 23.36 strongly agree 29.93 agree 13.87 neutral/don't know 16.06 disagree 14.60 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 34.31 strongly agree 18.25 agree 4.38 neutral/don't know 5.84 disagree 2.19 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 3.65 strongly agree 13.87 agree 24.82 neutral/don't know 29.93 disagree 27.01 strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
2.92 strongly agree 27.01 agree 27.74 neutral/don't know
23.36 disagreee 16.79 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 27.01 strongly agree 31.39 agree 21.17 neutral/don't know
8.03 disagree 8.76 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
67.88 strongly agree 25.55 agree 4.38 neutral/don't know
.73 disagree .73 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
35.77 strongly agree 29.93 agree 18.98 neutral/don't know
6.57 disagree 6.57 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 20.44 strongly agree 26.28 agree
29.93 neutral/don't know 14.60 disagree 8.76 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
57.66 strongly agree 17.52 agree 10.22 neutral/don't know
7.30 disagree 6.57 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 40.88 strongly agree
28.47 agree 6.57 neutral/don't know 7.30 disagree
8.03 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 31.39 strongly agree
34.31 agree 5.11 neutral/don't know 11.68 disagree
12.41 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 10.22 strongly agree 21.17 agree 28.47 neutral/don't know
23.36 disagree 16.79 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 27.74 strongly agree
51.09 agree 11.68 neutral/don't know 6.57 disagree
2.92 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 2.92 very effective
32.85 satisfactory 48.91 ineffective 13.14 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 15.33 always 43.07 usually 21.17 sometimes
   15.33 seldom 2.19 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 2.19 always 7.30 usually
   24.09 sometimes 42.34 seldom 21.90 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 2.19 always 16.79 usually
   22.63 sometimes 37.96 seldom 17.52 never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
6.57 always 38.69 usually 40.88 sometimes 6.57 seldom 6.57 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 5.84 always 42.34 usually 34.31 sometimes 13.87 seldom 2.19 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
6.57 always 40.88 usually 30.66 sometimes 18.25 seldom 2.19 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

6.57 personality differences make it difficult to talk
11.68 the supervisor often isn't around
10.95 the supervisor often seems too busy
4.38 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
5.84 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
5.11 you don't want to bother your supervisor
8.03 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
20.44 not applicable
13.14 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

15.33 personality differences make it difficult to talk
15.33 the department head often isn't around
21.90 the department head often seems too busy
24.82 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
16.79 the department head often seems in a negative mood
18.25 you don't want to bother your department head
13.87 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
27.01 the department head seems not to encourage communication
23.36 not applicable
13.87 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

16.06 personality differences make it difficult to talk
13.14 they usually aren't around
24.09 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
24.82 they appear uninterested in new ideas
8.76 they often seem to be in a negative mood
19.71 you don't want to bother them
37.96 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
43.07 they really don't encourage communication
16.06 not applicable
16.79 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 18.25 yes 20.44 no 43.07 maybe
15.33 don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 43.80 yes 51.09 no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 37.96 yes 58.39 no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 2.19 yearly 24.82 quarterly 44.53 monthly 17.52 weekly 6.57 not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 13.87 yearly 26.28 twice a year 32.85 quarterly 9.49 monthly 14.60 not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? .73 strongly agree 18.25 agree 40.15 neutral/don't know 13.87 disagree 23.36 strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 2.19 strongly agree 21.17 agree 29.93 neutral/don't know 29.20 disagree 13.87 strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant and productive? 15.33 strongly agree 27.74 agree 23.36 neutral/don't know 10.95 disagree 5.84 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 10.95 too much 65.69 just right 21.17 not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 9.49 too much 55.47 just right 33.58 not enough

3. My workload is: 28.47 more than I can handle 66.42 manageable 3.65 not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 21.17 excessive 45.26 adequate 23.36 inadequate 8.03 don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 4.38 excessive 48.18 adequate 40.15 inadequate 5.11 don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 56.93 increase it 17.52 have no effect 7.30 decrease it 16.06 don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 40.15 increase it 29.93 remain the same 18.98 decrease it 9.49 don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 48.91 increase it 29.20 remain the same 10.22 decrease it 10.22 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 48.18 high 33.58 moderate 8.76 low 6.57 none .73 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 57.66 high 21.17 moderate 10.95 low 5.84 none 1.46 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 13.14 high 37.23 moderate 22.63 low 22.63 none 1.46 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 21.90 high 36.50 moderate 19.71 low 18.25 none .73 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 27.74 high 34.31 moderate 17.52 low 14.60 none 2.19 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 5.84 strongly agree 16.06 agree 16.79 neutral/don'tknow 32.12 disagree 27.01 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 29.93 strongly agree 32.85 agree 6.57 neutral/don't know 16.06 disagree 12.41 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 20.44 strongly agree 34.31 agree 11.68 neutral/don't know 19.71 disagree 11.68 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 2.19 strongly agree 7.30 agree 21.17 neutral/don't know 35.77 disagree 30.66 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 32.85 strongly agree 35.77 agree 19.71 neutral/don't know 4.38 disagree 2.19 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 28.47 strongly agree 32.12 agree 24.09 neutral/don't know 7.30 disagree 2.92 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 48.91 essential 35.77 desirable 10.22 probably not necessary .73 not needed 2.19 don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 6.57 essential 30.66 desirable 31.39 probably not necessary 12.41 not needed 16.06 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 27.01 essential 27.74 desirable 21.17 probably not necessary 8.03 not needed 11.68 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 5.84 essential 41.61 desirable 20.44 probably not necessary 19.71 not needed 10.22 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 13.87 essential 31.39 desirable 21.90 probably not necessary 5.11 not needed 24.82 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 18.25 essential 32.85 desirable 20.44 probably not necessary 6.57 not needed 18.25 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 19.71 essential 26.28 desirable 22.63 probably not necessary 6.57 not needed 21.17 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 35.77 essential 18.98 desirable 21.17 probably not necessary .73 not needed 20.44 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 51.09 essential 33.58 desirable 9.49 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 2.92 don't know

j. increasing the number of subject specialists? 16.79 essential 21.90 desirable 25.55 probably not necessary 15.33 not needed 18.25 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 9.49 essential 23.36 desirable 27.74 probably not necessary 10.22 not needed 27.01 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 16.79 essential 21.90 desirable 25.55 probably not necessary 15.33 not needed 18.25 don't know

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: 0.00 very high 18.18 high 18.10 low 27.27 very low 27.27 ok 9.09 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 18.18 very high 27.27 high 18.18 low 0.00 very low 36.36 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 9.09 very high 63.64 high 9.09 low 9.09 very low 9.09 ok 0.00 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 18.18 often 45.45 sometimes 18.18 seldom 0.00 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 27.27 often 45.45 sometimes 9.09 seldom 0.00 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 9.09 often 54.55 sometimes 9.09 seldom 9.09 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 36.36 often 27.27 sometimes 18.18 seldom 0.00 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 0.00 often 18.18 sometimes 45.45 seldom 18.18 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 0.00 often 9.09 sometimes 9.09 seldom 63.64 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 0.00 often 27.27 sometimes 27.27 seldom 27.27 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 9.09 often 36.36 sometimes 27.27 seldom 9.09 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 9.09 often 63.64 sometimes 9.09 seldom 0.00 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 18.18 often 18.18 sometimes 9.09 seldom 9.09 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 9.09 often 45.45 sometimes 0.00 seldom 0.00 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 9.09 often 36.36 sometimes 0.00 seldom 9.09 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 18.18 often 36.36 sometimes 0.00 seldom 0.00 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 0.00 often 27.27 sometimes 18.18 seldom 9.09 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 0.00 often 9.09 sometimes 0.00 seldom 45.45 not at all

g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 0.00 often 27.27 sometimes 0.00 seldom 27.27 not at all

h. appeared ignorant about your work? 18.18 often 18.18 sometimes 9.09 seldom 9.09 not at all

i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 9.09 often 27.27 sometimes 9.09 seldom 9.09 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 27.27 always 27.27 usually 27.27 sometimes 18.18 seldom 0.00 never 0.00 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 18.18 always 18.18 usually 36.36 sometimes 27.27 seldom 0.00 never 0.00 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? 0.00 always 27.27 usually 18.18 sometimes 45.45 seldom 9.09 never 0.00 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 0.00 always 0.00 usually 18.18 sometimes 63.64 seldom 9.09 never 9.09 don't kn

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 9.09 strongly agree 45.45 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 36.36 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 27.27 strongly agree 63.64 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 18.18 strongly agree 63.64 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 9.09 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 0.00 strongly agree 45.45 agree 27.27 neutral/don't know 27.27 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 18.18 strongly agree 54.55 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know 9.09 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 9.09 strongly agree 27.27 agree 18.18 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 9.09 strongly agree 45.45 agree 27.27 neutral/don't know 18.18 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
18.18 strongly agree 18.18 agree 45.45 neutral/don't know
18.18 disagreee 0.00 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 36.36 strongly agree 36.36 agree 18.18 neutral/don't know
0.00 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
81.82 strongly agree 0.00 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know
0.00 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
45.45 strongly agree 18.18 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know
18.18 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 45.45 strongly agree 27.27 agree
9.09 neutral/don't know 18.18 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
18.18 strongly agree 9.09 agree 27.27 neutral/don't know
27.27 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 36.36 strongly agree
27.27 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 9.09 disagree
0.00 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 18.18 strongly agree
45.45 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree
0.00 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 18.18 strongly agree 36.36 agree 18.18 neutral/don't know
27.27 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 36.36 strongly agree
36.36 agree 27.27 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree
0.00 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 9.09 very effective
45.45 satisfactory 36.36 ineffective 0.00 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 0.00 always 54.55 usually 27.27 sometimes
   0.00 seldom 0.00 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 0.00 always 18.18 usually
   27.27 sometimes 27.27seldom 18.18 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 0.00 always 27.27 usually
   45.45 sometimes 18.18 seldom 0.00 never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
9.09 always 36.36 usually 45.45 sometimes 9.09 seldom 0.00 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 0.00 always 45.45 usually 18.18 sometimes 27.27 seldom 0.00 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
0.00 always 72.73 usually 18.18 sometimes 9.09 seldom 0.00 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

0.00 personality differences make it difficult to talk
0.00 the supervisor often isn't around
9.09 the supervisor often seems too busy
0.00 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
0.00 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
18.18 you don't want to bother your supervisor
0.00 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
18.18 not applicable
9.09 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

0.00 personality differences make it difficult to talk
0.00 the department head often isn't around
9.09 the department head often seems too busy
0.00 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
0.00 the department head often seems in a negative mood
9.09 you don't want to bother your department head
0.00 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
0.00 the department head seems not to encourage communication
45.45 not applicable
18.18 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

0.00 personality differences make it difficult to talk
0.00 they usually aren't around
9.09 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
0.00 they appear uninterested in new ideas
0.00 they often seem to be in a negative mood
0.00 you don't want to bother them
0.00 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
9.09 they really don't encourage communication
36.36 not applicable
18.18 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 9.09 yes 9.09 no 63.64 maybe
9.09 don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 54.55 yes 27.27 no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 54.55 yes 45.45 no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 0.00 yearly 0.00 quarterly 27.27 monthly 45.45 weekly 9.09 not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 36.36 yearly 27.27 twice a year 18.18 quarterly 0.00 monthly 18.18 not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? 0.00 strongly agree 72.73 agree 18.18 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 0.00 strongly agree 54.55 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 27.27 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant, and productive? 27.27 strongly agree 18.18 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 18.18 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 9.09 too much 81.82 just right 9.09 not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 9.09 too much 81.82 just right 9.09 not enough

3. My workload is: 45.45 more than I can handle 54.55 manageable 0.00 not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 0.00 excessive 45.45 adequate 54.55 inadequate 0.00 don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 0.00 excessive 72.73 adequate 27.27 inadequate 0.00 don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 63.64 increase it 18.18 have no effect 18.18 decrease it 0.00 don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 9.09 increase it 63.64 remain the same 18.18 decrease it 9.09 don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 54.55 increase it 36.36 remain the same 0.00 decrease it 9.09 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 36.36 high 54.55 moderate 0.00 low 9.09 none 0.00 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 36.36 high 27.27 moderate 9.09 low 18.18 none 0.00 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 9.09 high 54.55 moderate 18.18 low 9.09 none 0.00 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 0.00 high 63.64 moderate 18.18 low 9.09 none 0.00 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 18.18 high 36.36 moderate 18.18 low 18.18 none 0.00 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 45.45 strongly agree 36.36 agree 0.00 neutral/don'tknow 18.18 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 81.82 strongly agree 0.00 agree 9.09 neutral/don't know 9.09 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 36.36 strongly agree 27.27 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know 36.36 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 0.00 strongly agree 9.09 agree 18.18 neutral/don't know 45.45 disagree 18.18 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 0.00 strongly agree 36.36 agree 45.45 neutral/don't know 9.09 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 0.00 strongly agree 36.36 agree 27.27 neutral/don't know 27.27 disagree 9.09 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 27.27 essential 36.36 desirable 36.36 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 9.09 essential 45.45 desirable 36.36 probably not necessary 9.09 not needed 0.00 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 54.55 essential 27.27 desirable 18.18 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 9.09 essential 45.45 desirable 36.36 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 9.09 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 36.36 essential 45.45 desirable 18.18 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 45.45 essential 27.27 desirable 18.18 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 45.45 essential 18.18 desirable 27.27 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 36.36 essential 36.36 desirable 9.09 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 9.09 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 63.64 essential 36.36 desirable 0.00 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

j. increasing the number of subject specialists? 9.09 essential 36.36 desirable 36.36 probably not necessary 18.18 not needed 0.00 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 9.09 essential 18.18 desirable 45.45 probably not necessary 27.27 not needed 0.00 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 45.45 essential 27.27 desirable 27.27 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: .79 very high 3.97 high 30.16 low 38.89 very low 12.70 ok 12.70 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 3.97 very high 20.63 high 28.57 low 26.98 very low 19.05 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 9.52 very high 30.95 high 25.40 low 9.52 very low 17.46 ok 6.35 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 25.40 often 28.57 sometimes 26.19 seldom 19.05 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 46.03 often 32.54 sometimes 15.08 seldom 4.76 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 30.16 often 41.27 sometimes 17.46 seldom 10.32 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 19.05 often 20.63 sometimes 30.16 seldom 29.37 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 3.97 often 11.11 sometimes 22.22 seldom 61.90 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 9.52 often 11.11 sometimes 19.05 seldom 59.52 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 14.29 often 20.63 sometimes 16.67 seldom 47.62 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 19.84 often 22.22 sometimes 20.63 seldom 35.71 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 22.22 often 30.95 sometimes 26.19 seldom 19.05 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 35.71 often 17.46 sometimes 10.32 seldom 1.59 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 36.51 often 16.67 sometimes 7.14 seldom 4.76 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 30.16 often 20.63 sometimes 7.94 seldom 5.56 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 24.60 often 19.84 sometimes 10.32 seldom 10.32 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 1.59 often 9.52 sometimes 7.14 seldom 46.03 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 3.17 often 3.97 sometimes 11.11 seldom 46.03 not at all

g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 3.97 often 15.08 sometimes 10.32 seldom 34.13 not at all

h. appeared ignorant about your work? 5.56 often 7.94 sometimes 11.90 seldom 38.10 not at all

i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 27.78 often 21.43 sometimes 11.90 seldom 3.17 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 4.76 always 18.25 usually 23.02 sometimes 22.22 seldom 10.32 never 17.46 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 3.17 always 6.35 usually 19.05 sometimes 33.33 seldom 20.63 never 15.08 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? .79 always 2.38 usually 12.70 sometimes 42.06 seldom 25.40 never 13.49 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 1.59 always 5.56 usually 9.52 sometimes 38.10 seldom 19.05 never 23.02 don't kr

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 7.94 strongly agree 30.16 agree 9.52 neutral/don't know 39.68 disagree 12.70 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 43.65 strongly agree 47.62 agree 3.97 neutral/don't know 3.97 disagree .79 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 14.29 strongly agree 46.03 agree 10.32 neutral/don't know 21.43 disagree 6.35 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 3.17 strongly agree 20.63 agree 26.98 neutral/don't know 35.71 disagree 13.49 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 23.81 strongly agree 27.78 agree 15.08 neutral/don't know 16.67 disagree 15.87 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 36.51 strongly agree 17.46 agree 3.17 neutral/don't know 6.35 disagree 2.38 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 3.17 strongly agree 11.11 agree 24.60 neutral/don't know 30.95 disagree 29.37 strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
1.59 strongly agree 27.78 agree 26.19 neutral/don't know
23.81 disagreee 18.25 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 26.19 strongly agree 30.95 agree 21.43 neutral/don't know
8.73 disagree 8.73 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
66.67 strongly agree 27.78 agree 3.97 neutral/don't know
.79 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
34.92 strongly agree 30.95 agree 20.63 neutral/don't know
5.56 disagree 7.14 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 18.25 strongly agree 26.19 agree
31.75 neutral/don't know 14.29 disagree 9.52 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
61.11 strongly agree 18.25 agree 8.73 neutral/don't know
5.56 disagree 6.35 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 41.27 strongly agree
28.57 agree 6.35 neutral/don't know 7.14 disagree
8.73 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 32.54 strongly agree
33.33 agree 4.76 neutral/don't know 12.70 disagree
13.49 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 9.52 strongly agree 19.84 agree 29.37 neutral/don't know
23.02 disagree 18.25 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 26.98 strongly agree
52.38 agree 10.32 neutral/don't know 7.14 disagree
3.17 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 2.38 very effective
31.75 satisfactory 50.00 ineffective 14.29 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 16.67 always 42.06 usually 20.63 sometimes
   16.67 seldom 2.38 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 2.38 always 6.35 usually
   23.81 sometimes 43.65 seldom 22.22 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 2.38 always 15.87 usually
   20.63 sometimes 39.68 seldom 19.05 never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
6.35 always 38.89 usually 40.48 sometimes 6.35 seldom 7.14 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 6.35 always 42.06 usually 35.71 sometimes 12.70 seldom 2.38 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
7.14 always 38.10 usually 31.75 sometimes 19.05 seldom 2.38 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

7.14 personality differences make it difficult to talk
12.70 the supervisor often isn't around
11.11 the supervisor often seems too busy
4.76 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
6.35 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
3.97 you don't want to bother your supervisor
8.73 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
20.63 not applicable
13.49 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

16.67 personality differences make it difficult to talk
16.67 the department head often isn't around
23.02 the department head often seems too busy
26.98 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
18.25 the department head often seems in a negative mood
19.05 you don't want to bother your department head
15.08 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
29.37 the department head seems not to encourage communication
21.43 not applicable
13.49 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

17.46 personality differences make it difficult to talk
14.29 they usually aren't around
25.40 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
26.98 they appear uninterested in new ideas
9.52 they often seem to be in a negative mood
21.43 you don't want to bother them
41.27 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
46.03 they really don't encourage communication
14.29 not applicable
16.67 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 19.05 yes 21.43 no 41.27 maybe 15.87 don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 42.86 yes 53.17 no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 36.51 yes 59.52 no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 2.38 yearly 26.98 quarterly 46.03 monthly 15.08 weekly 6.35 not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 11.90 yearly 26.19 twice a year 34.13 quarterly 10.32 monthly 14.29 not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? .79 strongly agree 13.49 agree 42.06 neutral/don't know 15.08 disagree 24.60 strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 2.38 strongly agree 18.25 agree 31.75 neutral/don't know 29.37 disagree 14.29 strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant, and productive? 14.29 strongly agree 28.57 agree 24.60 neutral/don't know 10.32 disagree 6.35 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 11.11 too much 64.29 just right 22.22 not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 9.52 too much 53.17 just right 35.71 not enough

3. My workload is: 26.98 more than I can handle 67.46 manageable 3.97 not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 23.02 excessive 45.24 adequate 20.63 inadequate 8.73 don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 4.76 excessive 46.03 adequate 41.27 inadequate 5.56 don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 56.35 increase it 17.46 have no effect 6.35 decrease it 17.46 don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 42.86 increase it 26.98 remain the same 19.05 decrease it 9.52 don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 48.41 increase it 28.57 remain the same 11.11 decrease it 10.32 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 49.21 high 31.75 moderate 9.52 low 6.35 none .79 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 59.52 high 20.63 moderate 11.11 low 4.76 none 1.59 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 13.49 high 35.71 moderate 23.02 low 23.81 none 1.59 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 23.81 high 34.13 moderate 19.84 low 19.05 none .79 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 28.57 high 34.13 moderate 17.46 low 14.29 none 2.38 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 2.38 strongly agree 14.29 agree 18.25 neutral/don'tknow 33.33 disagree 29.37 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 25.40 strongly agree 35.71 agree 6.35 neutral/don't know 16.67 disagree 13.49 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 19.05 strongly agree 34.92 agree 12.70 neutral/don't know 18.25 disagree 12.70 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 2.38 strongly agree 7.14 agree 21.43 neutral/don't know 34.92 disagree 31.75 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 35.71 strongly agree 35.71 agree 17.46 neutral/don't know 3.97 disagree 1.59 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 30.95 strongly agree 31.75 agree 23.81 neutral/don't know 5.56 disagree 2.38 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 50.79 essential 35.71 desirable 7.94 probably not necessary .79 not needed 2.38 don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 6.35 essential 29.37 desirable 30.95 probably not necessary 12.70 not needed 17.46 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 24.60 essential 27.78 desirable 21.43 probably not necessary 8.73 not needed 12.70 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 5.56 essential 41.27 desirable 19.05 probably not necessary 21.43 not needed 10.32 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 11.90 essential 30.16 desirable 22.22 probably not necessary 5.56 not needed 26.98 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 15.87 essential 33.33 desirable 20.63 probably not necessary 7.14 not needed 19.84 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 17.46 essential 26.98 desirable 22.22 probably not necessary 7.14 not needed 23.02 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 35.71 essential 17.46 desirable 22.22 probably not necessary .79 not needed 21.43 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 50.00 essential 33.33 desirable 10.32 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 3.17 don't know

j. increasing the number of subject specialists? 17.46 essential 20.63 desirable 24.60 probably not necessary 15.08 not needed 19.84 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 9.52 essential 23.81 desirable 26.19 probably not necessary 8.73 not needed 29.37 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 19.05 essential 49.21 desirable 11.11 probably not necessary 1.59 not needed 16.67 don't know

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: 0.00 very high 6.25 high 20.83 low 45.83 very low 10.42 ok 14.58 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 4.17 very high 22.92 high 29.17 low 27.08 very low 14.58 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 8.33 very high 35.42 high 25.00 low 10.42 very low 10.42 ok 8.33 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 33.33 often 27.08 sometimes 20.83 seldom 18.75 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 43.75 often 35.42 sometimes 18.75 seldom 2.08 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 33.33 often 41.67 sometimes 18.75 seldom 6.25 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 31.25 often 25.00 sometimes 33.33 seldom 10.42 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 2.08 often 16.67 sometimes 25.00 seldom 56.25 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 16.67 often 8.33 sometimes 20.83 seldom 54.17 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 20.83 often 18.75 sometimes 18.75 seldom 41.67 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 18.75 often 25.00 sometimes 27.08 seldom 29.17 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 29.17 often 29.17 sometimes 20.83 seldom 20.83 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 25.00 often 18.75 sometimes 8.33 seldom 0.00 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 33.33 often 12.50 sometimes 2.08 seldom 4.17 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 29.17 often 12.50 sometimes 4.17 seldom 6.25 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 27.08 often 12.50 sometimes 6.25 seldom 6.25 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 2.08 often 8.33 sometimes 12.50 seldom 27.08 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 6.25 often 0.00 sometimes 10.42 seldom 33.33 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 2.08 often 10.42 sometimes 10.42 seldom 27.08 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 4.17 often 8.33 sometimes 8.33 seldom 29.17 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 20.83 often 16.67 sometimes 8.33 seldom 4.17 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 6.25 always 18.75 usually 22.92 sometimes 27.08 seldom 8.33 never 14.58 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 4.17 always 12.50 usually 22.92 sometimes 31.25 seldom 20.83 never 8.33 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? 2.08 always 4.17 usually 10.42 sometimes 45.83 seldom 29.17 never 8.33 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 0.00 always 6.25 usually 14.58 sometimes 31.25 seldom 22.92 never 25.00 don't kn

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 6.25 strongly agree 29.17 agree 10.42 neutral/don't know 43.75 disagree 10.42 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 39.58 strongly agree 45.83 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 4.17 disagree 2.08 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 16.67 strongly agree 41.67 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 22.92 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 4.17 strongly agree 20.83 agree 20.83 neutral/don't know 41.67 disagree 12.50 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 33.33 strongly agree 33.33 agree 10.42 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 14.58 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 27.08 strongly agree 14.58 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 2.08 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 2.08 strongly agree 20.83 agree 20.83 neutral/don't know 25.00 disagree 31.25 strongly disagree

Reference Services 3

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
4.17 strongly agree 29.17 agree 12.50 neutral/don't know
31.25 disagreee 22.92 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 25.00 strongly agree 39.58 agree 18.75 neutral/don't know
8.33 disagree 6.25 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
87.50 strongly agree 12.50 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know
0.00 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
47.92 strongly agree 31.25 agree 14.58 neutral/don't know
2.08 disagree 4.17 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 25.00 strongly agree 27.08 agree
20.83 neutral/don't know 18.75 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
50.00 strongly agree 18.75 agree 12.50 neutral/don't know
6.25 disagree 12.50 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 45.83 strongly agree
16.67 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 10.42 disagree
8.33 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 39.58 strongly agree
31.25 agree 2.08 neutral/don't know 10.42 disagree
14.58 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 8.33 strongly agree 31.25 agree 16.67 neutral/don't know
22.92 disagree 20.83 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 33.33 strongly agree
50.00 agree 6.25 neutral/don't know 6.25 disagree
4.17 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 2.08 very effective
27.08 satisfactory 62.50 ineffective 8.33 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 16.67 always 47.92 usually 18.75 sometimes
   16.67 seldom 0.00 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 2.08 always 4.17 usually
   20.83 sometimes 54.17 seldom 18.75 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 0.00 always 22.92 usually
   25.00 sometimes 39.58 seldom 12.50 never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
6.25 always 50.00 usually 39.58 sometimes 0.00 seldom 4.17 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 6.25 always 37.50 usually 41.67 sometimes 10.42 seldom 2.08 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
4.17 always 43.75 usually 31.25 sometimes 20.83 seldom 0.00 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

6.25 personality differences make it difficult to talk
10.42 the supervisor often isn't around
12.50 the supervisor often seems too busy
4.17 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
8.33 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
4.17 you don't want to bother your supervisor
10.42 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
14.58 not applicable
14.58 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

12.50 personality differences make it difficult to talk
22.92 the department head often isn't around
29.17 the department head often seems too busy
33.33 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
16.67 the department head often seems in a negative mood
8.33 you don't want to bother your department head
16.67 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
16.67 the department head seems not to encourage communication
16.67 not applicable
16.67 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

20.83 personality differences make it difficult to talk
12.50 they usually aren't around
22.92 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
27.08 they appear uninterested in new ideas
8.33 they often seem to be in a negative mood
22.92 you don't want to bother them
41.67 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
43.75 they really don't encourage communication
12.50 not applicable
20.83 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 18.75 yes 18.75 no 41.67 maybe
20.83 don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 52.08 yes 47.92 no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 41.67 yes 56.25 no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 0.00 yearly 4.17 quarterly 60.42 monthly 31.25 weekly 2.08 not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 6.25 yearly 33.33 twice a year 41.67 quarterly 8.33 monthly 6.25 not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? 0.00 strongly agree 18.75 agree 37.50 neutral/don't know 12.50 disagree 31.25 strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 2.08 strongly agree 20.83 agree 22.92 neutral/don't know 35.42 disagree 18.75 strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant and productive? 20.83 strongly agree 35.42 agree 20.83 neutral/don't know 14.58 disagree 6.25 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 16.67 too much 68.75 just right 12.50 not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 18.75 too much 58.33 just right 22.92 not enough

3. My workload is: 45.83 more than I can handle 52.08 manageable 2.08 not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 18.75 excessive 27.08 adequate 50.00 inadequate 4.17 don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 4.17 excessive 37.50 adequate 52.08 inadequate 6.25 don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 62.50 increase it 14.58 have no effect 4.17 decrease it 16.67 don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 60.42 increase it 29.17 remain the same 6.25 decrease it 4.17 don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 70.83 increase it 25.00 remain the same 2.08 decrease it 2.08 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 60.42 high 25.00 moderate 4.17 low 8.33 none 2.08 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 72.92 high 12.50 moderate 4.17 low 10.42 none 0.00 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 14.58 high 39.58 moderate 22.92 low 22.92 none 0.00 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 14.58 high 47.92 moderate 20.83 low 16.67 none 0.00 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 33.33 high 39.58 moderate 10.42 low 16.67 none 0.00 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 2.08 strongly agree 20.83 agree 8.33 neutral/don'tknow 31.25 disagree 37.50 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 41.67 strongly agree 29.17 agree 6.25 neutral/don't know 12.50 disagree 10.42 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 25.00 strongly agree 31.25 agree 12.50 neutral/don't know 16.67 disagree 14.58 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 4.17 strongly agree 8.33 agree 22.92 neutral/don't know 29.17 disagree 35.42 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 41.67 strongly agree 27.08 agree 25.00 neutral/don't know 0.00 disagree 4.17 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 33.33 strongly agree 22.92 agree 27.08 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 6.25 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 62.50 essential 27.08 desirable 8.33 probably not necessary 2.08 not needed ____ don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 10.42 essential 31.25 desirable 29.17 probably not necessary 16.67 not needed 12.50 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 29.17 essential 31.25 desirable 16.67 probably not necessary 6.25 not needed 10.42 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 10.42 essential 37.50 desirable 29.17 probably not necessary 14.58 not needed 8.33 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 16.67 essential 37.50 desirable 22.92 probably not necessary 2.08 not needed 20.83 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 22.92 essential 37.50 desirable 18.75 probably not necessary 4.17 not needed 16.67 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 18.75 essential 27.08 desirable 27.08 probably not necessary 4.17 not needed 22.92 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 43.75 essential 20.83 desirable 10.42 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 25.00 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 60.42 essential 33.33 desirable 6.25 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

j. increasing tne number of subject specialists? 33.33 essential 29.17 desirable 22.92 probably not necessary 4.17 not needed 10.42 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 14.58 essential 31.25 desirable 29.17 probably not necessary 6.25 not needed 18.75 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 22.92 essential 41.67 desirable 18.75 probably not necessary 2.08 not needed 14.58 don't know

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: 1.12 very high 4.49 high 33.71 low 33.71 very low 15.73 ok 11.24 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 5.62 very high 20.22 high 26.97 low 23.60 very low 23.60 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 10.11 very high 32.58 high 23.60 low 8.99 very low 20.22 ok 4.49 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 20.22 often 31.46 sometimes 28.09 seldom 16.85 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 44.94 often 32.58 sometimes 12.36 seldom 5.62 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 25.84 often 42.70 sometimes 15.73 seldom 12.36 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 14.61 often 19.10 sometimes 26.97 seldom 35.96 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 4.49 often 8.99 sometimes 23.60 seldom 59.55 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 4.49 often 12.36 sometimes 16.85 seldom 62.92 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 8.99 often 22.47 sometimes 16.85 seldom 48.31 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 19.10 often 22.47 sometimes 17.98 seldom 35.96 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 16.85 often 35.96 sometimes 26.97 seldom 15.73 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 39.33 often 16.85 sometimes 11.24 seldom 3.37 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 34.83 often 22.47 sometimes 8.99 seldom 4.49 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 28.09 often 26.97 sometimes 8.99 seldom 5.62 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 22.47 often 25.84 sometimes 11.24 seldom 11.24 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 1.12 often 12.36 sometimes 5.62 seldom 51.69 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 1.12often 6.74sometimes 10.11seldom 52.81not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 4.49often 19.10sometimes 8.99seldom 37.08not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 7.87often 8.99sometimes 13.48seldom 39.33not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 29.21often 24.72sometimes 13.48seldom 3.37not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 6.74always 19.10usually 23.60sometimes 19.10seldom 10.11never 16.85don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 4.49always 4.49usually 19.10sometimes 33.71seldom 17.98never 16.85don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? 0.00always 4.49usually 14.61sometimes 40.45seldom 21.35never 14.61don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 2.25always 4.49usually 7.87sometimes 44.94seldom 15.73never 20.22don't knc

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 8.99strongly agree 32.58agree 8.99neutral/don't know 37.08disagree 12.36strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 43.82strongly agree 50.56agree 2.25neutral/don't know 3.37disagree 0.00strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 13.48strongly agree 50.56agree 11.24neutral/don't know 19.10disagree 4.49strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 2.25strongly agree 23.60agree 30.34neutral/don't know 31.46disagree 12.36strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 17.98strongly agree 28.09agree 15.73neutral/don't know 20.22disagree 14.61strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 38.20strongly agree 20.22agree 6.74neutral/don't know 4.49disagree 2.25strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 4.49strongly agree 10.11agree 26.97neutral/don't know 32.58disagree 24.72strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
2.25strongly agree 25.84agree 35.96neutral/don't know
19.10disagreee 13.48strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 28.09strongly agree 26.97agree 22.47neutral/don't know
7.87disagree 10.11strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
57.30strongly agree 32.58agree 6.74neutral/don't know
1.12disagree 1.12strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
29.21strongly agree 29.21agree 21.35neutral/don't know
8.99disagree 7.87strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 17.98strongly agree 25.84agree
34.83neutral/don't know 12.36disagree 8.99strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
61.80strongly agree 16.85agree 8.99neutral/don't know
7.87disagree 3.37strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 38.20strongly agree
34.83agree 5.62neutral/don't know 5.62disagree
7.87strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 26.97strongly agree
35.96agree 6.74neutral/don't know 12.36disagree
11.24strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 11.24strongly agree 15.73agree 34.83neutral/don't know
23.60disagree 14.61strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 24.72strongly agree
51.69agree 14.61neutral/don't know 6.74disagree
2.25strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 3.37very effective
35.96satisfactory 41.57ineffective 15.73don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 14.61always 40.45usually 22.47sometimes
   14.61seldom 3.37never

   b. OTHER library departments? 2.25always 8.99usually
   25.84sometimes 35.96seldom 23.60never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 3.37always 13.48usually
   21.35sometimes 37.08seldom 20.22never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
6.74always 32.58usually 41.57sometimes 10.11seldom 7.87never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 5.62always 44.94usually 30.34sometimes 15.73seldom 2.25never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
7.87always 39.33usually 30.34sometimes 16.85seldom 3.37never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

6.74personality differences make it difficult to talk
12.36the supervisor often isn't around
10.11the supervisor often seems too busy
4.49the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
4.49the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
5.62you don't want to bother your supervisor
6.74the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
23.60not applicable
12.36other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

16.85personality differences make it difficult to talk
11.24the department head often isn't around
17.98the department head often seems too busy
20.22the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
16.85the department head often seems in a negative mood
23.60you don't want to bother your department head
12.36your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
32.58the department head seems not to encourage communication
26.97not applicable
12.36other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

13.48personality differences make it difficult to talk
13.48they usually aren't around
24.72they often seem too busy to be disturbed
23.60they appear uninterested in new ideas
8.99they often seem to be in a negative mood
17.98you don't want to bother them
35.96 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
42.70they really don't encourage communication
17.98not applicable
14.61other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 17.98yes 21.35no 43.82maybe
12.36don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 39.33yes 52.81no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 35.96yes 59.55no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 3.37yearly 35.96quarterly 35.96monthly 10.11weekly 8.99not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 17.98yearly 22.47twice a year 28.09quarterly 10.11monthly 19.10not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? 1.12strongly agree 17.98agree 41.57neutral/don't know 14.61disagree 19.10strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 2.25strongly agree 21.35agree 33.71neutral/don't know 25.84disagree 11.24strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant, and productive? 12.36strongly agree 23.60agree 24.72neutral/don't know 8.99disagree 5.62strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 7.87too much 64.04just right 25.84not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 4.49too much 53.93just right 39.33not enough

3. My workload is: 19.10more than I can handle 74.16manageable 4.49not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 22.47excessive 55.06adequate 8.99inadequate 10.11don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 4.49excessive 53.93adequate 33.71inadequate 4.49don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 53.93increase it 19.10have no effect 8.99decrease it 15.73don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 29.21increase it 30.34remain the same 25.84decrease it 12.36don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 37.08increase it 31.46remain the same 14.61decrease it 14.61don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 41.57high 38.20moderate 11.24low 5.62none 0.00don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 49.44high 25.84moderate 14.61low 3.37none 2.25don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 12.36high 35.96moderate 22.47low 22.47none 2.25don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 25.84high 30.34moderate 19.10low 19.10none 1.12don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 24.72high 31.46moderate 21.35low 13.48none 3.37don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 7.87strongly agree 13.48agree 21.35neutral/don'tknow 32.58disagree 21.35strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 23.60strongly agree 34.83agree 6.74neutral/don't know 17.98disagree 13.48strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 17.98strongly agree 35.96agree 11.24neutral/don't know 21.35disagree 10.11strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 1.12strongly agree 6.74agree 20.22neutral/don't know 39.33disagree 28.09strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 28.09strongly agree 40.45agree 16.85neutral/don't know 6.74disagree 1.12strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 25.84strongly agree 37.08agree 22.47neutral/don't know 6.74disagree 1.12strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 41.57essential 40.45desirable 11.24probably not necessary 0.00not needed 3.37don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 4.49essential 30.34desirable 32.58probably not necessary 10.11not needed 17.98don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 25.84essential 25.84desirable 23.60probably not necessary 8.99not needed 12.36don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 3.37essential 43.82desirable 15.73probably not necessary 22.47not needed 11.24don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 12.36essential 28.09desirable 21.35probably not necessary 6.74not needed 26.97don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 15.73essential 30.34desirable 21.35probably not necessary 7.87not needed 19.10don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 20.22essential 25.84desirable 20.22probably not necessary 7.87not needed 20.22don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 31.46essential 17.98desirable 26.97probably not necessary 1.12not needed 17.98don't know

i. active retraining programs? 46.07essential 33.71desirable 11.24probably not necessary 0.00not needed 4.49don't know

j. increasing the number of subject specialists? 7.87essential 17.98desirable 26.97probably not necessary 21.35not needed 22.47don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 6.74essential 19.10desirable 26.97probably not necessary 12.36not needed 31.46don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 20.22essential 50.56desirable 8.99probably not necessary 1.12not needed 15.73don't know

GENERAL IDENTIFICATION (given in numbers, not percentages)

1. My position is in an ACADEMIC SERIES (e.g. Librarian)?
17 yes 62 no

2. My position is in a CLASSIFIED STAFF series (e.g. Library Assistant)?
68 yes 13 no

3. I hold one of the following positions: Department Head, AUL, or UL?
7 yes 66 no

4. The greater percentage of my time, or all my time, is spent working in one of the following Departments: Arts Library, Government Publications, Map and Imagery Laboratory, Reference Department, Sciences Engineering Library, Special Collections? 0 yes 0 no

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: 0.00 very high 8.33 high 36.11 low 22.22 very low 16.67 ok 13.89 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 8.33 very high 16.67 high 19.44 low 19.44 very low 33.33 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 11.11 very high 38.89 high 5.56 low 11.11 very low 22.22 ok 8.33 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 22.22 often 30.56 sometimes 27.78 seldom 13.89 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 41.67 often 38.89 sometimes 11.11 seldom 2.78 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 27.78 often 33.33 sometimes 19.44 seldom 13.89 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 25.00 often 33.33 sometimes 19.44 seldom 16.67 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 2.78 often 16.67 sometimes 25.00 seldom 50.00 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 16.67 often 11.11 sometimes 25.00 seldom 41.67 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 16.67 often 13.89 sometimes 25.00 seldom 38.89 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 16.67 often 33.33 sometimes 22.22 seldom 22.22 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 19.44 often 41.67 sometimes 13.89 seldom 19.44 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 8.33 often 11.11 sometimes 5.56 seldom 5.56 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 8.33 often 19.44 sometimes 0.00 seldom 2.78 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 8.33 often 16.67 sometimes 2.78 seldom 2.78 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 5.56 often 19.44 sometimes 2.78 seldom 2.78 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 0.00 often 8.33 sometimes 8.33 seldom 11.11 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 0.00 often 5.56 sometimes 2.78 seldom 19.44 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 0.00 often 11.11 sometimes 2.78 seldom 13.89 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 5.56 often 11.11 sometimes 2.78 seldom 8.33 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 5.56 often 13.89 sometimes 5.56 seldom 2.78 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 8.33 always 30.56 usually 25.00 sometimes 13.89 seldom 8.33 never 8.33 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 8.33 always 22.22 usually 33.33 sometimes 16.67 seldom 8.33 never 5.56 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? 0.00 always 11.11 usually 27.78 sometimes 36.11 seldom 13.89 never 5.56 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 0.00 always 8.33 usually 22.22 sometimes 44.44 seldom 11.11 never 8.33 don't kn

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 8.33 strongly agree 36.11 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 38.89 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 19.44 strongly agree 61.11 agree 13.89 neutral/don't know 2.78 disagree 2.78 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 11.11 strongly agree 44.44 agree 11.11 neutral/don't know 19.44 disagree 11.11 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 0.00 strongly agree 30.56 agree 22.22 neutral/don't know 38.89 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 25.00 strongly agree 36.11 agree 11.11 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 13.89 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 8.33 strongly agree 11.11 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 2.78 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 5.56 strongly agree 36.11 agree 27.78 neutral/don't know 19.44 disagree 11.11 strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
8.33 strongly agree 30.56 agree 25.00 neutral/don't know
22.22 disagreee 13.89 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 27.78 strongly agree 38.89 agree 22.22 neutral/don't know
0.00 disagree 11.11 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
75.00 strongly agree 22.22 agree 0.00 neutral/don't know
0.00 disagree 2.78 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
30.56 strongly agree 36.11 agree 5.56 neutral/don't know
11.11 disagree 11.11 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 27.78 strongly agree 33.33 agree
19.44 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 11.11 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
30.56 strongly agree 25.00 agree 22.22 neutral/don't know
11.11 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 33.33 strongly agree
27.78 agree 2.78 neutral/don't know 5.56 disagree
13.89 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 30.56 strongly agree
38.89 agree 2.78 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree
13.89 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 11.11 strongly agree 36.11 agree 16.67 neutral/don't know
22.22 disagree 13.89 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 25.00 strongly agree
61.11 agree 8.33 neutral/don't know 2.78 disagree
2.78 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 0.00 very effective
50.00 satisfactory 44.44 ineffective 2.78 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 8.33 always 50.00 usually 19.44 sometimes
   16.67 seldom 0.00 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 0.00 always 11.11 usually
   27.78 sometimes 47.22 seldom 11.11 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 0.00 always 25.00 usually
   36.11 sometimes 27.78 seldom 8.33 never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
2.78 always 30.56 usually 58.33 sometimes 2.78 seldom 5.56 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 2.78 always 38.89 usually 27.78 sometimes 19.44 seldom 8.33 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
5.56 always 44.44 usually 25.00 sometimes 22.22 seldom 2.78 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

2.78 personality differences make it difficult to talk
2.78 the supervisor often isn't around
5.56 the supervisor often seems too busy
0.00 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
0.00 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
8.33 you don't want to bother your supervisor
0.00 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
5.56 not applicable
5.56 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

11.11 personality differences make it difficult to talk
5.56 the department head often isn't around
19.44 the department head often seems too busy
25.00 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
16.67 the department head often seems in a negative mood
13.89 you don't want to bother your department head
2.78 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
16.67 the department head seems not to encourage communication
22.22 not applicable
25.00 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

11.11 personality differences make it difficult to talk
8.33 they usually aren't around
16.67 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
16.67 they appear uninterested in new ideas
5.56 they often seem to be in a negative mood
13.89 you don't want to bother them
22.22 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
27.78 they really don't encourage communication
22.22 not applicable
13.89 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 19.44 yes 16.67 no 44.44 maybe
16.67 don't know

The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 44.44 yes 50.00 no

I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 41.67 yes 52.78 no

I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 5.56 yearly 11.11 quarterly 55.56 monthly 16.67 weekly 5.56 not at all

I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 19.44 yearly 44.44 twice a year 27.78 quarterly 2.78 monthly 5.56 not at all

The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? 0.00 strongly agree 50.00 agree 22.22 neutral/don't know 8.33 disagree 19.44 strongly disagree

The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 0.00 strongly agree 44.44 agree 13.89 neutral/don't know 27.78 disagree 13.89 strongly disagree

If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant and productive? 16.67 strongly agree 30.56 agree 16.67 neutral/don't know 16.67 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 25.00 too much 66.67 just right 8.33 not enough

The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 16.67 too much 69.44 just right 13.89 not enough

My workload is: 52.78 more than I can handle 44.44 manageable 2.78 not enough to keep me busy

Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 11.11 excessive 36.11 adequate 52.78 inadequate 0.00 don't know

Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 5.56 excessive 50.00 adequate 38.89 inadequate 5.56 don't know

How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 72.22 increase it 8.33 have no effect 8.33 decrease it 8.33 don't know

How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 55.56 increase it 30.56 remain the same 11.11 decrease it 2.78 don't know

How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 63.89 increase it 27.78 remain the same 2.78 decrease it 5.56 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 50.00 high 33.33 moderate 16.67 low 0.00 none 0.00 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 50.00 high 25.00 moderate 16.67 low 5.56 none 0.00 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 11.11 high 47.22 moderate 27.78 low 11.11 none 0.00 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 8.33 high 50.00 moderate 25.00 low 11.11 none 2.78 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 25.00 high 30.56 moderate 27.78 low 11.11 none 2.78 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 11.11 strongly agree 27.78 agree 11.11 neutral/don'tknow 41.67 disagree 8.33 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 47.22 strongly agree 25.00 agree 16.67 neutral/don't know 5.56 disagree 5.56 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 22.22 strongly agree 30.56 agree 13.89 neutral/don't know 19.44 disagree 13.89 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 0.00 strongly agree 16.67 agree 19.44 neutral/don't know 38.89 disagree 22.22 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 30.56 strongly agree 33.33 agree 25.00 neutral/don't know 5.56 disagree 5.56 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 25.00 strongly agree 33.33 agree 25.00 neutral/don't know 13.89 disagree 2.78 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 41.67 essential 44.44 desirable 13.89 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 13.89 essential 38.89 desirable 27.78 probably not necessary 5.56 not needed 13.89 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 27.78 essential 38.89 desirable 13.89 probably not necessary 8.33 not needed 11.11 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 11.11 essential 47.22 desirable 25.00 probably not necessary 5.56 not needed 11.11 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 11.11 essential 41.67 desirable 22.22 probably not necessary 2.78 not needed 22.22 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 33.33 essential 36.11 desirable 13.89 probably not necessary 2.78 not needed 11.11 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 30.56 essential 33.33 desirable 19.44 probably not necessary 2.78 not needed 11.11 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 47.22 essential 25.00 desirable 11.11 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 13.89 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 63.89 essential 27.78 desirable 8.33 probably not necessary 0.00 not needed 0.00 don't know

j. increasing tne number of subject specialists? 25.00 essential 36.11 desirable 25.00 probably not necessary 8.33 not needed 5.56 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 16.67 essential 30.56 desirable 25.00 probably not necessary 16.67 not needed 11.11 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 30.56 essential 44.44 desirable 11.11 probably not necessary 2.78 not needed 11.11 don't know

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION, COMMUNICATION AND STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

1. In my opinion, overall morale in the LIBRARY is: 1.02 very high 4.08 high 27.55 low 42.86 very low 12.24 ok 12.24 don't know

2. In my opinion, overall morale in my DEPARTMENT is: 4.08 very high 23.47 high 31.63 low 25.51 very low 15.31 ok 0.00 don't know

3. On the average, my morale is: 9.18 very high 32.65 high 30.61 low 9.18 very low 14.29 ok 4.08 don't know

4. In the last year how often has your DEPARTMENT HEAD:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 25.51 often 30.61 sometimes 24.49 seldom 18.37 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 45.92 often 31.63 sometimes 15.31 seldom 5.10 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 28.57 often 45.92 sometimes 16.33 seldom 8.16 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 18.37 often 17.35 sometimes 32.65 seldom 30.61 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 3.06 often 11.22 sometimes 21.43 seldom 63.27 not at all

   f. refused or avoided helping you? 6.12 often 11.22 sometimes 15.31 seldom 66.33 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 12.24 often 23.47 sometimes 15.31 seldom 47.96 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 20.41 often 18.37 sometimes 20.41 seldom 38.78 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 22.45 often 31.63 sometimes 27.55 seldom 16.33 not at all

5. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head, please answer this question: In the last year how often has your Immediate SUPERVISOR:

   a. expressed confidence in your abilities? 43.88 often 20.41 sometimes 11.22 seldom 1.02 not at all

   b. passed along work-related information in a timely and effective way? 43.88 often 19.39 sometimes 8.16 seldom 5.10 not at all

   c. objectively explained in detail new policies or procedures? 36.73 often 24.49 sometimes 8.16 seldom 7.14 not at all

   d. asked for your suggestions or opinions? 31.63 often 21.43 sometimes 12.24 seldom 11.22 not at all

   e. confronted you with unconstructive criticism? 2.04 often 12.24 sometimes 7.14 seldom 55.10 not at all

5. f. refused or avoided helping you? 4.08 often 3.06 sometimes 13.27 seldom 56.12 not at all

   g. tried to pass the buck about who made a decision and why? 5.10 often 17.35 sometimes 12.24 seldom 41.84 not at all

   h. appeared ignorant about your work? 6.12 often 8.16 sometimes 15.31 seldom 46.94 not at all

   i. expressed appreciation for a job well-done? 33.67 often 25.51 sometimes 13.27 seldom 4.08 not at all

6. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to receiving MERIT INCREASES in this library? 6.12 always 15.31 usually 22.45 sometimes 25.51 seldom 9.18 never 18.37 don't know

7. How often are hard work and accomplishment the keys to ADVANCEMENT in this library? 3.06 always 2.04 usually 16.33 sometimes 38.78 seldom 22.45 never 16.33 don't know

8. How often do you think the library deals effectively with incompetence? 1.02 always 2.04 usually 8.16 sometimes 43.88 seldom 27.55 never 15.31 don't know

9. How often do you think the library deals effectively with those who cheat the system (e.g., those who take 45 minute coffee breaks, hour and a half lunches, use sick leave to take long weekends)? 2.04 always 4.08 usually 6.12 sometimes 37.76 seldom 21.43 never 26.53 don't kn

10. In my opinion the physical environment within the library (e.g., the appearance of the work place, the comfort of the furniture, the adequacy of the lighting, the noise level, the temperature of the work place) makes it a pleasant place to work? 8.16 strongly agree 29.59 agree 8.16 neutral/don't know 41.84 disagree 12.24 strongly disagree

11. Overall, I have a good working relationship with the people in my department? 50.00 strongly agree 44.90 agree 1.02 neutral/don't know 4.08 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

12. In general, my DEPARTMENT is run efficiently? 16.33 strongly agree 46.94 agree 10.20 neutral/don't know 21.43 disagree 4.08 strongly disagree

13. In general, the LIBRARY is run efficiently? 4.08 strongly agree 19.39 agree 28.57 neutral/don't know 35.71 disagree 12.24 strongly disagree

14. My DEPARTMENT HEAD treats employees as people rather than objects? 23.47 strongly agree 28.57 agree 15.31 neutral/don't know 17.35 disagree 14.29 strongly disagree

15. If your immediate supervisor is NOT your Department Head please answer this question: My immediate SUPERVISOR treats employees as people rather than objects? 43.88 strongly agree 21.43 agree 3.06 neutral/don't know 6.12 disagree 3.06 strongly disagree

16. The LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION treats employees as people rather than objects? 3.06 strongly agree 6.12 agree 22.45 neutral/don't know 34.69 disagree 32.65 strongly disagree

17. In general, the policies and procedures used to evaluate the work of library employees ensure fair and honest treatment?
1.02 strongly agree 25.51 agree 28.57 neutral/don't know
25.51 disagreee 17.35 strongly disagree

18. I know what performance standards I must meet to receive a merit increase? 26.53 strongly agree 29.59 agree 19.39 neutral/don't know
11.22 disagree 8.16 strongly disagree

19. Excellence of library service is personally very important to ME?
66.33 strongly agree 26.53 agree 5.10 neutral/don't know
1.02 disagree 0.00 strongly disagree

20. Excellence of library service is very important to my DEPARTMENT HEAD?
38.78 strongly agree 28.57 agree 22.45 neutral/don't know
5.10 disagree 4.08 strongly disagree

21. Excellence of library service is very important to members of the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 18.37 strongly agree 24.49 agree
33.67 neutral/don't know 16.33 disagree 7.14 strongly disagree

22. Considering my duties, a more flexible work schedule would seldom inconvenience other library employees or library users?
67.35 strongly agree 15.31 agree 7.14 neutral/don't know
5.10 disagree 5.10 strongly disagree

23. All in all, I respect my SUPERVISOR? 44.90 strongly agree
27.55 agree 7.14 neutral/don't know 8.16 disagree
6.12 strongly disagree

24. All in all, I respect my DEPARTMENT HEAD? 32.65 strongly agree
33.67 agree 6.12 neutral/don't know 13.27 disagree
11.22 strongly disagree

25. All in all, I respect the members of this library's ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP? 10.20 strongly agree 16.33 agree 31.63 neutral/don't know
24.49 disagree 17.35 strongly disagree

26. Everything considered, I really like my job? 29.59 strongly agree
47.96 agree 11.22 neutral/don't know 8.16 disagree
3.06 strongly disagree

COMMUNICATION

1. I feel that the formal channels of communication withing the library (i.e., via the library's hierarchy) are usually: 3.06 very effective
26.53 satisfactory 52.04 ineffective 17.35 don't know

2. How often do you feel you are kept well-informed about decisions made within:

   a. your DEPARTMENT? 18.37 always 40.82 usually 22.45 sometimes
   14.29 seldom 3.06 never

   b. OTHER library departments? 3.06 always 6.12 usually
   22.45 sometimes 42.86 seldom 24.49 never

   c. the LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION? 3.06always 13.27 usually
   18.37 sometimes 42.86 seldom 20.41never

3. How often do you hear needed information first through the grapevine?
8.16 always 43.88 usually 33.67 sometimes 7.14 seldom 7.14 never

4. How often do you receive MEMOS or MINUTES in time to act or respond effectively to the issues discussed? 7.14 always 43.88 usually 36.73 sometimes 12.24 seldom 0.00 never

5. How often do your receive VERBAL INFORMATION on policies and procedures in time to act or respond effectively to the issues under discussion?
7.14 always 38.78 usually 33.67 sometimes 17.35 seldom 2.04 never

6. If your supervisor is NOT your Department Head, check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your SUPERVISOR with questions or work-related problems.

8.16 personality differences make it difficult to talk
15.31 the supervisor often isn't around
13.27 the supervisor often seems too busy
6.12 the supervisor appears uninterested in new ideas
8.16 the supervisor often seems in a negative mood
4.08 you don't want to bother your supervisor
11.22 the supervisor seems not to encourage communication
26.53 not applicable
15.31 other

7. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach your DEPARTMENT HEAD with questions or work-related problems.

16.33 personality differences make it difficult to talk
19.39 the department head often isn't around
23.47 the department head often seems too busy
25.51 the department head appears uninterested in new ideas
17.35 the department head often seems in a negative mood
20.41 you don't want to bother your department head
18.37 your supervisor might consider it going over her/his head
31.63 the department head seems not to encourage communication
22.45 not applicable
10.20 other

8. Check any reasons below that affect your willingness to approach LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS (i.e., AUL's, the UL) with questions and/or problems.

17.35 personality differences make it difficult to talk
14.29 they usually aren't around
26.53 they often seem too busy to be disturbed
28.57 they appear uninterested in new ideas
9.18 they often seem to be in a negative mood
21.43 you don't want to bother them
42.86 your department head would consider it going over her/his head
50.00 they really don't encourage communication
12.24 not applicable
18.37 other

9. Would it help communication if Department Heads and the Library Administration had open office hours during which any employee could drop in without an appointment? 18.37 yes 21.43 no 42.86 maybe
15.31 don't know

10. The goals, objectives, and priorities of my DEPARTMENT are periodically discussed with me? 42.86 yes 53.06 no

11. I know the goals, objectives, and priorities of the LIBRARY? 35.71 yes 62.24 no

12. I would like to have interactive and informative DEPARTMENTAL meetings? 1.02 yearly 30.61 quarterly 41.84 monthly 17.35 weekly 6.12 not at all

13. I would like to have interactive and informative LIBRARY-WIDE meetings? 11.22 yearly 20.41 twice a year 36.73 quarterly 12.24 monthly 17.35 not at all

14. The formal Library channels for lodging a work-related complaint usually provide an effective way to resolve a problem? 1.02 strongly agree 7.14 agree 47.96 neutral/don't know 16.33 disagree 24.49 strongly disagree

15. The formal lines of communication provide an effective means of communicating library decisions and discussions? 3.06 strongly agree 13.27 agree 35.71 neutral/don't know 31.63 disagree 13.27 strongly disagree

16. If your department has departmental meetings, answer the following: departmental meetings in my department are usually informative, relevant and productive? 15.31 strongly agree 27.55 agree 26.53 neutral/don't know 9.18 disagree 5.10 strongly disagree

STAFFING MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

1. The amount of VARIETY in my job is: 5.10 too much 67.35 just right 26.53 not enough

2. The amount of CHALLENGE in my job is: 6.12 too much 52.04 just right 41.84 not enough

3. My workload is: 19.39 more than I can handle 76.53 manageable 4.08 not enough to keep me busy

4. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARIANS and/or other ACADEMIC staff in my department is: 25.51 excessive 48.98 adequate 13.27 inadequate 11.22 don't know

5. Considering the tasks and programs our department must accomplish, the number of LIBRARY ASSISTANTS and/or other CLASSIFIED staff in my department is: 4.08 excessive 46.94 adequate 42.86 inadequate 5.10 don't know

6. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect your work PRODUCTIVITY? 53.06 increase it 20.41 have no effect 7.14 decrease it 19.39 don't know

7. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the VARIETY in your work? 34.69 increase it 30.61 remain the same 22.45 decrease it 12.24 don't know

8. How do you feel that using new technologies and automation will affect the CHALLENGE of your work? 43.88 increase it 30.61 remain the same 13.27 decrease it 12.24 don't know

9. In general, how much interest do you have in career development activities? 50.00 high 33.67 moderate 6.12 low 8.16 none 1.02 don't know

10. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time and with the LIBRARY paying any related expenses? 62.24 high 21.43 moderate 9.18 low 5.10 none 2.04 don't know

11. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on YOUR own time and with YOU paying for any related expenses? 14.29 high 35.71 moderate 21.43 low 26.53 none 2.04 don't know

12. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs on LIBRARY time but with YOUR money? 27.55 high 33.67 moderate 18.37 low 20.41 none 0.00 don't know

13. How much interest do you have in attending career development programs with LIBRARY monetary support but on YOUR own time? 29.59 high 37.76 moderate 14.29 low 15.31 none 2.04 don't know

14. This number was mistakenly skipped over on the original questionnaire

15. I feel that the Library provides adequate support for the career development of its employees? 3.06 strongly agree 12.24 agree 19.39 neutral/don'tknow 29.59 disagree 35.71 strongly disagree

16. I feel my knowledge, skills, and abilities are well used in my current position? 23.47 strongly agree 36.73 agree 3.06 neutral/don't know 21.43 disagree 15.31 strongly disagree

17. There is a feeling of working as a team in my DEPARTMENT? 19.39 strongly agree 37.76 agree 11.22 neutral/don't know 19.39 disagree 11.22 strongly disagree

18. There is a feeling of working as a team in the LIBRARY? 3.06 strongly agree 4.08 agree 22.45 neutral/don't know 35.71 disagree 34.69 strongly disagree

19. I would like more opportunity for creative and original thought in my job? 35.71 strongly agree 37.76 agree 17.35 neutral/don't know 4.08 disagree 1.02 strongly disagree

20. I would like to be able to use more independent judgement in my job? 31.63 strongly agree 32.65 agree 23.47 neutral/don't know 5.10 disagree 3.06 strongly disagree

21. Indicate the degree to which you think the following changes will be needed if the Library's staff is to be able to meet future service demands. (Future service demands will include automated access to text, online access to numberic databases, remote access to numerous library catalogs, end use access to bibliographic databases, etc., as well as rising expectations from more graduate students and a greater research emphasis at UCSB).

    a. a well-supported and carefully planned career development program? 54.08 essential 33.67 desirable 8.16 probably not necessary 1.02 not needed 3.06 don't know

b. split assignments (e.g., having work assignments in two or more departments)? 4.08 essential 29.59 desirable 32.65 probably not necessary 15.31 not needed 17.35 don't know

c. raising performance expectations for merit increases, promotions and job retention? 27.55 essential 25.51 desirable 23.47 probably not necessary 8.16 not needed 12.24 don't know

d. job rotation (e.g. temporary reassignment to another job)? 5.10 essential 40.82 desirable 18.37 probably not necessary 25.51 not needed 10.20 don't know

e. use of personnel in other job classifications (e.g. computer programmers)? 14.29 essential 28.57 desirable 23.47 probably not necessary 6.12 not needed 26.53 don't know

f. reassignment of duties? 14.29 essential 31.63 desirable 23.47 probably not necessary 8.16 not needed 21.43 don't know

g. reassignment of personnel? 17.35 essential 24.49 desirable 23.47 probably not necessary 8.16 not needed 25.51 don't know

h. reorganization of the library? 33.67 essential 17.35 desirable 24.49 probably not necessary 1.02 not needed 23.47 don't know

i. active retraining programs? 48.98 essential 35.71 desirable 10.20 probably not necessary 4.08 not needed 1.02 don't know

j. increasing tne number of subject specialists? 14.29 essential 17.35 desirable 26.53 probably not necessary 18.37 not needed 23.47 don't know

k. increasing the number of generalists? 8.16 essential 21.43 desirable 28.57 probably not necessary 8.16 not needed 33.67 don't know

l. additional retirement options (e.g. financial incentives for early retirement)? 19.39 essential 50.00 desirable 12.24 probably not necessary 1.02 not needed 17.35 don't know

Task Force on Organizational,
Communication and Staffing Questionnaire

Summary of Comments to Part II: Open Ended Questions

1) ORGANIZATIONAL STYLE

"Organizational style" is used to categorize the comments and recommendations from the OCS Questionnaire about the Administration's ability to initiate and affect change. Organizational style was mentioned 283 times on Questions A - E of Part II of the Questionnaire. Some employee comments concerning this were "implement an honest, open, direct style of management", "do more long range planning ... in conjunction with employee input, [to develop] a clear system of objectives [and] goals ...", "Direct department heads and supervisors on how to treat staff members as people", and "work on building a reputation for excellence in work and service". These comments were directed to all levels of supervisors.

Problems mentioned, such as the lack of "flexibility and understanding", "lack of communication", the lack of "articulated goals and objectives", or the "lack of meetings" are all perceived as contributing to a lower level of morale, and are seen as being the result of the present organizational styles. Cooperation between academic and classified staff was also perceived by respondents as being negatively affected by current organizational styles.

2) VISIBLE AND INTERACTIVE MANAGEMENT

"Visible and interactive management" is a management style mentioned by 59 employees in Part II of the OCS Questionnaire, which could help to improve the areas of communication and morale in the Library. Statements ranged from not recognizing members of the Library Administration, to requests for the University Librarian (U.L.) to "mingle". Staff requested a more visible and interactive management.

Suggestions and requests were made that the U.L. have "open office hours", "visit departments on a regular basis", talk with all levels of staff, hold regular meetings with departments, and have "brown bag" lunches in the staff room.

The consensus from responses was that the interest, motivation, and morale of the staff would be positively affected if the Library Administration demonstrated an interest in all levels of work done in the Library.

3) ACCOUNTABILITY

Many comments expressed the need to hold all library employees equally accountable for their performances. The lack of accountability at all levels and ranks is seen as a detriment to good morale in the Library. This conclusion is gleaned from 155 responses in Part II of the OCS Questionnaire. Getting rid of "dead wood" and dealing with people who "cheat the system" were expressions used frequently. Accountability was also mentioned as an important factor of communication (or breakdown in communication) in the Library.

The lack of up-to-date and known job standards was seen as one of the causes of problems between librarians and classified staff (from both points of view).

Many employees believe incompetence and misuse of break and lunch time are ignored and follow this example, rather than pursuing higher levels of performance and behavior.

Many responses indicated a belief that the Library Administration merely transfers problem or incompetent employees to other jobs or departments rather than directly dealing with the problem. People wrote that this is very detrimental to the morale of conscientious employees, often stifling their motivation to do an even better job.

4) JOB AUDITS

References to some type of job audits (including a skills inventory) were cited 82 times in the questionnaire comments. A majority of the respondents saw audits as a means for making more effective use of library employees (Section C). "There would be better matching of job skills with job duties." There should be "surveys of employee's languages, subject and other skills to determine how to best use these to improve patron service".

A thorough re-examination of library positions was seen as a strong factor in contributing to improved morale (Section A). Audits were recommended as a means to identify such perceived job inequities as "unequal distribution of work", "underutilized" or "overutilized staff", and disparities in job classification.

Through reorganization of duties, people felt some jobs which are "boring, repetitive, and dead ended" could be made more interesting and "create more challenging and creative outlets".

Respondents felt that new job structures could provide employees with opportunities for advancement and at the same time supply the Library with a pool of better qualified and more versatile staff. The comments also suggested that an impartial outside

agency conduct the audit to insure more objectivity in data gathering and in assessing the final results.

Employees indicated that audits could also result in improving cooperation between academic and classified staff (Section E) because each job would then be more accurately defined and the expectations for performance more clearly determined. "Give duties commensurate with rank". "Clearly establish requirements and qualifications for employment in each category". "Cooperation cannot happen until duties and responsibilities are fairly assigned".

5) **COMMUNICATION / CONFIDENTIALITY**

Communication within the Library was mentioned 229 times in the open-ended section of the OCS Questionnaire. Effective communication was stressed with two-way channels of communication and confidentiality respected. "There cannot be effective two-way communication unless people trust, respect, and have confidence in each other". A recurrent theme was that supervisors made final decisions without consulting their subordinates, and that those decisions negatively impacted the work unit. In cases where subordinates were consulted, many felt that input was disregarded with no explanation as to why, or their innovative ideas were implemented with the supervisor taking credit. "Once creativity is stifled, it is sometimes hard to rekindle it".

Drawing from questionnaire responses, communication regarding decision-making could be summarized as a five part continuing process: 1) to speak (or write) honestly; 2) to encourage appropriate comments, ideas on that which was spoken; 3) to listen carefully and receptively to those responses; 4) to act or implement according to one's best ability, and finally; 5) to explain one's actions clearly and openly as to the origin of any creative innovations.

As a new approach to improved communication, it was repeatedly emphasized that library goals and objectives must be clearly stated. Many seemed doubtful as to what those goals and objectives are, or that they even exist.

Suggestions made to improve communication included: 1) a management statement issued on a preferred communication style; 2) courses offered to enhance open communications; 3) supervisors held accountable for maintaining clear communication channels; 4) "quality circles" implemented which cross departmental and job classification lines; 5) more frequent meetings / forums held at all levels; 6) a confidential suggestion box made available for expressing personnel difficulties; and 7) a regular newsletter issued in-house.According to OCS Questionnaire tabulations these are ways of increasing understanding between library assistant / librarian levels, and making more effective use of library employees.

6) REWARDS / PRAISE / RECOGNITION

The OCS Questionnaire solicited comments and ideas on ways to recognize or reward outstanding or creative employees without monetary remunerations. Several people still mentioned things such as monetary bonuses, job reclassifications, and all expenses paid vacations, citing "money talks" as their motivating force.

Within the non-monetary suggestions, the need for verbal or written recognition was the most frequently used response. It was suggested that recognition could be relayed privately, in a peer group, at a meeting, in Schedule and Report, or at a library awards ceremony. One person viewed the lack of recognition as a communication breakdown and stated, "There is a lack of incentive to do good work because it is not appreciated or rewarded". Another indicated that an effective method of praise would be to "implement good ideas with credit going to that idea's creator".

Many people responded that time off work could be used as a reward for doing a good job. Uses for this time off varied from the taking of work-related courses, to time off for vacations, birthdays, office parties, etc.

A skills assessment of current employees appealed to several people as a way to identify untapped personnel resources. This could be used to promote cross-training, job rotation, or split assignment procedures to make better use of available talents.

Comments indicated that the Staff Special Performance Award is a major morale problem because many believe it is administered inequitably. Repeat recipients were seen as "favorites". "I'd like to see a fairer way of picking those people who get the Special Performance Awards."

Two other suggestions were: 1) to "review every employee who had three outstanding evaluations and is at the top of his / her class" and explore new applications for his / her talents; 2) to rectify certain physical discomforts at the work station due to heating, lighting, and furniture needs.

A number of respondents said that mediocrity is felt to be rewarded in some employees, with excellence expected in others. "It can be a reward to know that a mediocre or marginal employee has ... been given the message that mediocre performance is not acceptable". There was no mention of how this could be implemented, nor of the time factor involved in such an undertaking.

7) **COURSES, CONTINUING EDUCATION, RETRAINING**

The OCS report addressed these topics primarily as a means for better utilization of human resources to meet the future service demands, and in some cases as rewards for outstanding performance.

The questionnaire comments (in which these terms were mentioned 87 times) provided two lines of thought. One dealt with the need to educate and retrain employees who needed to improve performance in areas such as inter-personal relations, oral and written communication skills, managerial competencies and technical expertise. "Some supervisors are very competent at their particular job but lack tremendously in inter-personal relations". "Have supervisors ... be skilled in communication skills". "Increase the level of professional competency of middle managers". Comments further suggested that if such training does not result in improved performance in these areas, the employee must be held accountable for failure to adapt and improve. Successful results, it was believed, would lead to better morale since improved communication and leadership would result. People felt it would also promote better cooperation between the ranks (Section E) as it could result in a "change of attitude".

The other line of thought concerned continuing education, retraining, and courses resulting in optimal use of employees (Section C). It was perceived as giving the organization a staff "well educated in library work, expand[ing] employee horizons, and keep[ing] people challenged and interested". It could be seen as raising up "competency levels" and enabling employees to have the opportunity for advancement, thus contributing to higher morale (Section A).

Besides making better use of employees, the opportunity for continuing education was seen as a reward (Section D) because learning new job skills, job rotation, cross training, etc. alleviates some of the boredom resulting from tedious, repetitive routines. "Cross training can give staff a more global feel for the group effort involved in the delivery of library services". "Time off to pursue education inside and outside of the current job requirements" is a reward which also motivates and encourages better job performance.

8) **MEETINGS / FORUMS**

Responses emphasized establishing a more formal mode of communication. Tabulations reveal 49 comments which regard the number and quality of meetings in the Library as lacking. Responses indicated that goals and objectives of the Library and departments could be discussed and clarified at these meetings. For example, it was suggested "that department heads hold at least monthly meetings with their staff, giving them a clear idea of where they are going as a department and how each [person]

contributes to it in relation to clear-cut performance standards agreed upon by managers and staff".

The frequency of meetings/forums necessary varied with the responses and according to the number of library employees in attendance. As a guideline, phrases like "as necessary" were mentioned, but with "regularly scheduled" and "held accountable to hold them" as qualifiers. Those supervisors who lack the skills to conduct meetings should be encouraged to obtain the necessary training.

Comments indicated that open, two-way communication should be mandatory in smaller forums. They should "provide opportunities for staff to discuss problems frankly with someone they can trust and who will preserve confidentiality ... This is very necessary when communications with line officers is unsatisfactory".

9) ALTERNATE WORK SCHEDULES

There were 47 comments asking for the option of having some variation in work schedules. The ability to work an alternate schedule is predominantly mentioned as a factor in improving morale. (Section A.)

The phrase "alternate work schedules" more accurately describes the term referred to in the questionnaire as "flexible work schedules". The adjective "flexible" was used because employees appear to be more familiar with that expression. It appears that when "flex time" or "flexible schedules" were mentioned, respondents meant an alternate work schedule (defined as a regularly set work schedule, with the opportunity for more variations than there are in the presently existing schedules).

Though restoration of alternate schedules is seen as a definite means to improving morale, employees were careful to indicate that they must be used "in a reasonable way", "with control", "as an option", "within reason", "when feasible", "with core periods provided for", and "when it will not inconvenience the department". The ability to have an alternate work schedule would make employees "more satisfied and better workers". It would "give the staff the feeling that they are human beings rather than exploited objects".

The comments also mentioned other reasons for alternate schedules exercise/health - all within departmental requirements for adequate staffing levels at one time, as well as assurance of honesty." Some comments stated that not allowing alternate schedules causes hardships on employees who require some flexibility due to childcare demands and "long distance travels to work or in order to pursue their avocation."

The comments also mentioned alternate work schedules as a way of providing rewards for good performance. They also indicated that

these privileges should be "rescinded if abused" or if performance did not remain consistently high.

10) **SOCIAL INTERACTION**

Some employees stated that social activities bring together people on levels aside from their job classification or department. These can create a "positive interaction between administrators and the rank and file."

The most frequently mentioned benefit derived from social activities is in improving morale. In addition to this, employees stated that social activities also encourage communication by being an informal way to meet, a good way to express management styles, and an excellent opportunity for visible and interactive management.

Several mentions were made of social interaction as a reward or form of job performance recognition. Some suggestions included: picnics, lunches, potlucks, coffee/teas, happy hours, sports teams.

Appreciation for last September's Library Picnic was prevalent. "The Picnic is/was a great idea! And fun!"